

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 7872) for the relief of the heirs of George H. Hitchcock; to the Committee on Military Affairs. Also, a bill (H. R. 7873) for the relief of Anna Myers Brownell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 7874) granting an increase of pension to Margaret R. Smallwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7875) granting an increase of pension to Hattie B. Search; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. A. P. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 7876) granting a pension to Martha E. Gunderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 7877) granting a pension to Ellen Belle Coffland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: A resolution (H. Res. 154) appointing Curtis Grimes as successor to person named in House resolution adopted January 15, 1900; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A resolution (H. Res. 155) appointing George C. Keegan as successor to person named in House resolution adopted January 15, 1900; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: A resolution (H. Res. 157) appointing John A. Hillmyer as successor to the person named in House resolution adopted January 15, 1900; to the Committee on Accounts.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2076. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Miss Alice St. Clair, of Sioux City, Iowa, urging a tariff duty on motion-picture films imported into this country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2077. Also (by request): Petition of Mrs. Anna Guth, president of the Betty Ross Council, of Elyria, Ohio, urging recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2078. Also (by request): Petition of Stephen Miller and 299 others of the eleventh congressional district of Missouri; James G. Maloney and 144 others of the eighth district of Kansas; 1,230 residents of the cities of Cincinnati, Norwood, and Glendale, all in the first and second districts of Ohio; and Blanche Herman and 25 others, citizens of the United States, urging recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2079. By Mr. DYER: Petition of Carondelet Baptist Church, of St. Louis, Mo., indorsing House joint resolution 159; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2080. By Mr. ELSTON: Resolution of Elm Lodge, No. 234, Knights of Pythias, of East Oakland, Calif., relative to a national educational policy; to the Committee on Education.

2081. By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 7665, for the relief of Priscilla Boyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2082. By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Petition of various residents of Wellesley Hills, Mass., for relief of Armenians in the Near East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2083. By Mr. KIESS: Resolution from Methodist Episcopal Church, of Osceola, Pa., favoring amendment to Volstead Prohibition Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2084. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the Southern Traffic League, of Charlotte, N. C., opposing the passage of either Senate bill 1807 or House bill 7106; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2085. By Mr. LAYTON: Petition of the Garden Club of Wilmington, Del., approving the passage of Senate bill 4485 and House bill 2166; to the Committee on the Library.

2086. Also, petition of William Beadenkopf Co., of Wilmington, Del.; C. Wilson McNeely, chairman goat and cabrette leather division of the Tanners' Council of Philadelphia, Pa.; Amalgamated Leather Co. (Inc.), of New York, N. Y.; Newcastle Leather Manufacturing Co. and J. E. Rhoades & Sons, of Wilmington, Del., opposing a duty on hides and skins in the Fordney tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2087. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Samuel M. Dell & Co., of Baltimore, Md., protesting against tariff on brushes; also, petition of the Torsch-Summers Co., of Baltimore, Md., protesting against tariff on turnips; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2088. Also, petition of Delcher-Parsons Co., of Baltimore, Md., protesting against new schedule of walnuts; also, petition of the Deford Co., of Baltimore, Md., protesting against duty on hides and skins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2089. By Mr. A. P. NELSON: Petition of Superior Civic and Commerce Association, of Superior, Wis., relating to the Federal Trade Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2090. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to memorializing Congress to enact into law the Voigt bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2091. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, urging Congress to pass the farmers' export financing corporation bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2092. Also, petition of Ladysmith League of Women Voters, urging a conference on disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2093. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of National Pepsin Gum Co., of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the placing of a duty on tin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2094. Also, petition of California State Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, urging the enactment of legislation for the relief of the disabled veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### SENATE.

THURSDAY, July 21, 1921.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 20, 1921.)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gerry	McKellar	Shortridge
Ball	Glass	McKinley	Simmons
Borah	Gooding	McNary	Smoot
Brandegee	Harris	Moses	Stanfield
Broussard	Harrison	Nelson	Sterling
Bursum	Heflin	New	Sutherland
Cameron	Johnson	Nicholson	Townsend
Capper	Kellogg	Norbeck	Trammell
Caraway	Kendrick	Norris	Underwood
Culberson	Kenyon	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Keyes	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Ladd	Randsell	Warren
Ernst	La Follette	Reed	Watson, Ga.
Fernald	Lodge	Robinson	Willis
Fletcher	McCormick	Sheppard	

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], and the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] are absent on official business of the Senate.

I also wish to announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] are engaged in a hearing before the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] is absent on business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WILLIS presented a memorial of J. W. Watt and sundry other citizens of Mansfield and Shelby, both in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation making stringent regulations for the observance of Sunday in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Van Wert, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a letter, in the nature of a petition, from Thompson, Hine & Flory, attorneys, representing sundry printing companies, of Cleveland, Ohio, praying that an appropriation be made to continue the monthly report on labor conditions and the cost of living issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CAPPER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Colby, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation making stringent regulations for the observance of Sunday in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Marion County, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Ralston-Nolan bill or any sales or single tax bill, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LADD presented the petition of Mrs. Robert H. Green and sundry other members of the Church Guild, of Grand Forks,

N. Dak., praying that the United States afford protection and relief for the suffering people of the Near East, particularly of Armenia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented three petitions of sundry citizens of Oakdale, Killdeer, Dunn Center, Werner, and Manning, all in the State of North Dakota, praying that the United States recognize the republic of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 2288) authorizing the payment to the administrator of the late Ephraim Perkins, captain, of the value of his three-quarters of brigantine *Eliza* and cargo, illegally captured by the French, as ascertained by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 2289) to amend subdivision (e) of section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2290) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to regulate radio communication," approved August 13, 1912; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 86) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LADD (by request):

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 87) to reimburse Susan Sanders for expenses and services rendered in behalf of the Eastern, Emigrant, and Western Cherokees by blood; to the Committee on Claims.

#### EXPORTATION OF FARM PRODUCTS.

Mr. McCORMICK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1915) to provide for the purchase of farm products in the United States, to sell the same in foreign countries, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### AMENDMENTS TO MATERNITY AND INFANCY BILL.

Mr. KING submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1039) for the public protection of maternity and infancy and providing a method of cooperation between the Government of the United States and the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### LOTS IN HOT SPRINGS, ARK.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a statement by the trustees and chairman, board of stewards of the Third Street Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Hot Springs, Ark., to accompany the bill (S. 2215) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and convey certain lots in Hot Springs, Ark., to the Third Street Methodist Episcopal Church South, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

#### EXPORTATION OF FARM PRODUCTS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1915) to provide for the purchase of farm products in the United States, to sell the same in foreign countries, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to speak very briefly in regard to the bill now pending before the Senate. It may create some surprise that I speak upon the bill actually before the Senate, but such is my purpose.

This bill provides for the purchase of farm products in the United States, in order to sell the same in foreign countries, and for other purposes.

I will say frankly at the outset that it seems to me a dangerous bill and one that deserves the most careful consideration of the Senate. It creates a corporation to be known as the farmers' export financing corporation. It puts the United States into active business. I think at this time the more we take the United States out of business and the less we put it in the better. Anything more lamentable than the two attempts of the United States to carry on business by running the railroads and creating shipping I think it would be difficult to find.

I am in favor of and have voted for measures looking to governmental supervision of certain great industries, but there is a wide gulf fixed between Government supervision and the actual management of business by the Government. The pend-

ing bill puts the Government into the business of buying and selling agricultural products on a very large scale.

In the course of the debate, the War Finance Corporation has been used as if it were a precedent for this bill and its foundation. It is true the bill has certain formal clauses which were taken from the War Finance Corporation act, but the pending bill and the War Finance Corporation act are as different as night and day. The War Finance Corporation was created in the first place for war purposes. I thought it a very dangerous experiment even then, but many things have to be done and many things are done in time of war which war justifies, which ought not to be done at any other time.

The War Finance Corporation act provided for the financing of certain industries for the purpose of aiding in the war. It has been very well managed, but never for a minute was it in business for itself in the sense of dealing in any product of any kind. Moreover, the War Finance Corporation operated under a law which was drawn with the utmost care and under very decided limitations. As I proceed, I shall endeavor to show the broad distinction between the War Finance Corporation and the corporation created by the provisions of this bill.

If anything of this character is to be done in order to promote farm exports and aid agriculture in all its many forms, it could be done, as it seems to me, and ought to be done, if done at all, under the provisions of the War Finance Corporation act. It seems to me that there is no need of two corporations, but that an addition to the powers of the War Finance Corporation as it is now operating could be drafted in such a way as to cover all that ought properly to be done in regard to the export of farm products and with a view to assisting our agriculture.

I realize, Mr. President, as fully as anybody how much the great agricultural interests of the country, both North and South, and in all forms have suffered from the operation of economic forces which no legislation can ever control, although it may soften their effect. This bill, as I have said, creates the farmers' export finance corporation. Under amendments reported by the committee its personnel is to consist of the Secretary of Agriculture and two additional persons. The vast powers which are given in the bill are all bestowed upon three men, with no definition as to the character or type of men who shall be selected.

The proposed corporation involves, as its name implies, large financial operations. I have been informed that the Secretary of Agriculture has stated to the committee that he was not a financier, that he had given but little attention to questions of finance, and that he said but very little, if anything, about that matter at the hearings held by the committee. Who the other two members of the corporation shall be is not specified. In the case of the War Finance Corporation, on the other hand, the Secretary of the Treasury was placed at its head, and, of course, he is the responsible financial officer of the Government.

I come now to section 9 of the bill which gives the power to the proposed agricultural corporation to buy and sell agricultural products; that is, it puts the United States into the active business of buying and selling all of the many products of agriculture. The United States itself is to engage in this vast and complicated business and is totally unfit for such a task. The proposed corporation will have the right not only to sell to individuals but also to sell to any "Government or subdivision of Government" outside of the United States. They may enter upon business relations with every nation and every people in the world without any recourse, apparently, to the advice of the great department which is charged with the conduct of our foreign relations. It is a very perilous thing to have three gentlemen, with no particular knowledge of our foreign relations, suddenly given an unlimited power to deal with Governments and subdivisions of Governments outside the United States. Nobody ought to deal with other Governments except the Executive, acting through the State Department. So strongly has that view always been held that it will be found, I think, about 1795—but, at any rate, at the close of the eighteenth century—there was passed an act, which is known as the Logan Act, which has been on the statute books ever since, which provides serious penalties for anyone not officially accredited opening negotiations of any sort, either directly or indirectly, with a foreign Government. Of course, the gentlemen who are to manage the farmers' export financing corporation will be official; they will have such credit from our Government as goes with this act; but I am very much opposed to giving anyone the right to deal with foreign Governments except the Executive, who has that power in any event, acting through persons who are selected for that duty.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President—



The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether, in his opinion, it would strengthen this bill if the powers proposed to be conferred by it were lodged in the hands of the War Finance Corporation, now operating under existing law? Would that aid the bill at all?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. I think all the proper purposes of this proposed act could be entirely fulfilled and that all we ought to do in that direction could be done by giving some additional powers to the War Finance Corporation.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. KELLOGG. If I may be allowed to make a suggestion, I desire to say that I am informed that the War Finance Corporation, which has a capital of \$500,000,000, has now available over \$400,000,000 immediately to engage in aiding the export business, and that it has to a certain extent an organization now engaged in that work. For instance, it has arranged for storage or warehouse facilities in nearly every country in the world and it is ready, if it is given the power so far as financing is concerned, to do almost anything that may be done under the pending bill.

Mr. LODGE. That is my own judgment, Mr. President.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. In connection with the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota, which the Senator from Massachusetts seems to approve—

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. That the War Finance Corporation could do anything that is authorized to be done under this bill—

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; I did not say that.

Mr. NORRIS. I thought the Senator did not mean that.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; I meant the War Finance Corporation could do anything so far as authorized under the law of its creation.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is not in favor of giving the War Finance Corporation the powers that the pending bill proposes to give to the farmers' export financing corporation?

Mr. LODGE. I certainly am not.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Nebraska misunderstood me. I did not mean that the War Finance Corporation could do everything that could be done under this bill, but in so far as financing operations are concerned, exclusive of purchasing and selling, it could do so, or its powers could be enlarged so that it could engage in such activities.

Mr. LODGE. The War Finance Corporation could use the powers that it has, which could be extended to agricultural products.

On page 5, lines 15 and 16, the bill reads:

Every such advance—

That is, advances for the purpose of assisting in financing the exportation of agricultural products—

shall be secured by adequate security of such character as shall be prescribed by the board of directors of a value at the time of such advance—as estimated and determined by the board of directors—equal to at least 100 per cent of the amount advanced by the corporation.

That leaves it entirely to the judgment of the board as to what constitutes an adequate security. They may be able to judge well as to the value of credits and securities in this country, but certainly three men, taken at haphazard, can hardly be expected to understand the very intricate and difficult subject of foreign credits.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator says "at haphazard." These men will be selected by the President?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. I had reference to the lack of any definition in the bill.

Mr. BORAH. And they will be confirmed by the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. They will.

Mr. BORAH. No haphazard men could get through here.

Mr. LODGE. Possibly not; the Senator's experience and mine show that to be impossible.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Some very "haphazard" men who have not only been getting in but have been reappointed, if I may make the suggestion to the Senators.

Mr. LODGE. I am afraid the Senator from Georgia does not altogether appreciate the irony with which the Senator from Idaho was speaking. I myself never use irony, but I understood the implication of the remarks of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Speaking of "haphazard appointments," the War Finance Corporation, which those who oppose the pending bill now seem to love so much, with the exception of its head—and the head of the agricultural corporation is provided for in the bill in a similar manner—would be subject to the same criticism, would it not?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator has reference to the other four members?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; but at the head of the War Finance Corporation there is the officer of the Government who is charged with all the financial operations of the country, whose business it is to be a financier, and who is surrounded by experts in his department. The Secretary of Agriculture is not chosen for that purpose; he has nothing whatever to do with its financial matters, and there is no reason to suppose he has any special knowledge concerning them. He is not at the head of a department which knows anything about finance. It knows much about various things—seeds, plants, and so forth—but I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture is selected because of any knowledge he may have of the subject of finance.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not claim that; but he is selected because he has agricultural knowledge, and it is an agricultural corporation that is proposed to be created.

Mr. LODGE. I understand that.

Mr. NORRIS. Why may not the President select as the assistants of the head of the proposed corporation those who have financial knowledge and thus make the board complete?

Mr. LODGE. That might be done; but it is made the duty of the proposed agricultural corporation under this bill to make advances, to lend money to people who need it, and its principal business is financial.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator probably means people who "want it," not necessarily who need it.

Mr. LODGE. Well, to those who want it or need it.

The proposed corporation is given the power "to buy agricultural products either in their natural state or prepared or manufactured from any person in the United States," and then to sell such products; in other words, they are going to carry on an enormous business in agricultural products. They need not sell any of them; they can hold them.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. And commodities made from agricultural products.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know how far that will extend. I take only the language of the bill; I shall come to the industrial side of it in a moment; but the proposed agricultural corporation is to have the enormous power of holding all the property which they may acquire. At what price are they going to take it? At what price are they going to sell it? Evidently there is conferred upon them the power of price fixing, which is the most dangerous power that can be conferred, in my judgment.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, if my friend the Senator from Massachusetts will allow me, he has referred heretofore to agricultural products; but if he will read the bill, as he no doubt has done—I merely mean to call his attention to the matter, of course, and do so with great respect—he will see it is not confined to agricultural products at all.

Mr. LODGE. That makes it much worse. I was taking the language of a particular section; I know the corporation can go further.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Let me refer to the first line on page 5, if the Senator will allow me.

Mr. LODGE. I read it—"either in their natural state or prepared or manufactured."

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. That would include hides, Mr. President, and shoes.

Mr. LODGE. Why, under that clause they could buy and sell cotton textiles—

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Harness, shoes, saddles, mercerized fabrics, and so on.

Mr. LODGE. Anything made from the products of the farm—leather, woolens, and everything else. But the point I desired to emphasize is the danger that is involved in putting the United States into business of any kind. The United States, as I have already said, is sure to run a business badly. It has wrecked the railroads, and look at the Shipping Board!

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, that is the connection in which I referred to the haphazard way in which we appoint and reappoint here. We have just found a deficit of \$4,000,000,000 in the Shipping Board. We are asked to fur-

nish \$300,000,000 more to fill another hole, and, of course, that will be followed by filling another hole; and the former chairman of the Shipping Board is a reappointee on that board.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am not criticizing the make-up of any of the boards. I know that we put over \$3,000,000,000 into the Shipping Board. I know that last year they lost at the rate of more than a million dollars a day as a deficit, and I believe it is owing to the fundamental fact that the Government of the United States is utterly unfit to carry on a business, especially if it tries to carry it on with a board. It might do better with one man, though I do not think the railroads indicate that it would.

Mr. President, I did not mean to take much time. I turn now to section 10. The limitation of that section, of course, occurs in the War Finance Corporation act. It has been stricken out. It seemed to me a valuable limitation. I happened to be on the committee, with other Senators who are doing me the honor to listen to me, that reported the War Finance Corporation act. There was a great deal of work put into that act, and every security and safeguard that the committee could think of was applied to it, and one of them was as to the amount of advances permitted to any one person. The limitation which was in this bill already, when I suppose it was perhaps copied from the War Finance Corporation act, has been stricken out. There is no limitation. They can lend any amount they please to lend to one person.

Now, we come to section 10. The corporation is empowered and authorized to issue and have outstanding at any one time bonds in an amount aggregating not more than ten times its paid-in capital. That is, this board of three men have the right to issue a thousand million dollars in bonds. They have the right to issue bonds carrying the lowest exemption. I may be mistaken, but I think it follows exactly the exemption of the first or 3½ per cent loan. That is, they issue a bond on the most favorable conditions, and the interest and the maturity are left to them, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

That is an enormous sum of money. If those bonds were thrown on the market now, with the guaranty of the United States, with the exemptions proposed in the bill, and at a rate of interest of 5 per cent, we will say, or 5½, which has been proposed for the rural credits, I think, it would almost destroy the Liberty loans of the United States. It is a most extraordinary power to give. I have had it said to me: "Why, those bonds could not be placed." Under this language this corporation can issue a bond which can be easily placed, and placed to the great detriment of the entire credit of the United States. It is a huge sum—a thousand millions in addition to their capital. In all, it amounts to eleven hundred millions.

Mr. President, further on there was a section in this bill, section 14, which was taken, as some others were taken, from the Finance Corporation act—clauses which vanished when it passed to the question of agriculture. Section 14, as the bill was originally introduced, read:

The United States shall not be liable for the payment of any bond or other obligation, or the interest thereon, issued or incurred by the corporation, nor shall it incur any liability in respect of any act or omission of the corporation.

That has been stricken out, and in its place has been put this clause:

The United States shall be liable for the payment of all bonds and other obligations, together with interest thereon, issued by the corporation.

And there is no protection against any act or omission on the part of the corporation.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. If the Senator will allow me in that connection, it is pertinent and important to say that while the United States Government is responsible for all these debts, it has no say, none whatever, as to the security on which the corporation shall lend this money.

Mr. LODGE. None. That alone, in itself, seems to me a power that ought not to be given.

Very recently, within a few days, the Senate recommitted the bonus bill. It was recommitted by the votes of many Senators who were anxious to see that adjusted compensation paid to the soldiers, but who were convinced that it would be dangerous to the finances of the United States—so dangerous that it ought to be deferred. Now we are asked to take a billion dollars and put it into the bonds which could be issued under this bill, that would be absolutely destructive to the credit of the United States.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator if he knows whether this bill was sent down to the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain what in his judgment would be its effect upon the credit of the Nation?

Mr. LODGE. In reply to the Senator from Virginia I will say that I have no knowledge as to whether it was ever submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury at all. I was told that the committee did not call the Secretary of the Treasury to hear him in regard to the bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator there?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. The committee did call the Secretary of the Treasury. At the time that they invited him to appear, however, he had another appointment, and he was not able to appear, and as a matter of fact did not; but he was invited to appear. I am not criticizing him because he did not appear, because he was appearing before some other committee at the same time.

Mr. LODGE. It appears, then, that he was asked, and that he was appearing before another committee and could not come that day; but he was not asked again. I did not mean to take up that point; but I think on a bill of this financial magnitude the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury ought to be taken.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, in that connection I call the Senator's attention to section 17, which no doubt he intends to comment upon when he reaches it. The others are mere details; but under that section the Interstate Commerce Commission could and probably would give to this national corporation preferential rights that would absolutely drive off the market every competitor in America.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I was going to touch on that.

Now come the penal clauses, and then section 17, where the Senator from Georgia has anticipated me in what I was about to say; but there is exactly that danger. I was astounded to see that provision.

Mr. President, I have only touched on some of the leading points, those that seem to me most dangerous.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, does the Senator intend to discuss the effect that such a corporation with such capital might have on general market conditions in the United States?

Mr. LODGE. I do not expect to do it with any thoroughness. I was about to allude to it. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that it is not my intention to speak at any great length. I only wanted to bring out my objections. Moreover, I do not wish to interfere with the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I was calling the Senator's attention to that matter in the hope that he would speak of it.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, I understand; the Senator was very kind about it.

Mr. President, I heard the very vivid and eloquent descriptions of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] of the condition of the farmers who could not get money, and the country banks that were on the verge of failure, and I have no doubt that there is great hardship in all those directions. The Senator from North Carolina spoke about this having been brought on by the inability of the planters, of whom he was particularly speaking, to sell their crops at any price even reasonably approaching the cost of the crops. Now, we give them this money. At what rate are we to give it to them? Suppose we take the thousand millions and distribute it in advances to worthy and suffering planters and farmers and cattle growers and sheep raisers, and so forth. I know they have suffered. I do not underrate it at all. At what rate are we to give it to them? And if we give them the money and take their products, at what price are we to take them? If we take them far above the market price, then this corporation will simply go on holding them all. They will be unable to sell them, here or anywhere else. Of course, this corporation could practically arrest all dealings and fix a price, which would paralyze everybody's business. Just as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WATSON] has pointed out, if they have this power in regard to freights, they can shut every competitor out of the transport. But after the farmers and banks get this money and these advances, suppose there comes another bad year; what is to be done then? Must there be another thousand millions? This is not business. It is a huge gift from the Treasury which is proposed.

I know very well that the idea of this bill is that we are to create markets. Mr. President, no amount of money that this Congress can appropriate will create a market. Markets are not created in that way. What will give us a market abroad is the return of the purchasing power of the nations which formerly bought of us and whose purchasing power has been



spent and wasted on four years of battle. You can not create a market by merely buying up at artificial prices the agricultural products of this country. The market must be created by the natural and imperative laws of supply and demand.

Mr. President, I know that seems to be, and will be considered by many people, a harsh doctrine, and to indicate that I do not realize the suffering. Mr. President, this suffering from the present operation of economic laws following the war is not confined to the plantations of the South or to the farms of the West. The great industrial States of this country are just as severely affected. Take, for instance, an industry that is almost wholly western—mining. Look at the condition of the mines to-day. All, I rather think, have reduced time, even if they are able to work at all.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. KING. I would like to state to the Senator that in many of the Western States mines have been closed down; indeed, in some States practically all mining operations have ceased, and large quantities of copper, and some lead and pyrites and other metals, are stored and stacked away; there is absolutely no market for them. It seems to me that if we are to care for the people in this way, if the Government is to become a fairy godmother and take care of the farmers and their products, it must extend its benefactions to the mining men, and if it extends its parental authority there, what shall we say of the man who has brain and brawn and muscle, and who wants work and can not get it? Why should we not coin that product which he has in such rich abundance, so that he may live?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was about to touch on the point which the Senator from Utah stated very well. For instance, I think all copper mines in this country, so far as I know, are closed down. They are not making any money, certainly. They are carrying all the crude copper that they can carry. That is a very great industry; it is one of our great exports. But they have not come here asking that the Government should give them a thousand million. They have not come here yet asking for Government aid.

Take the great, purely industrial regions. I come from one of the largest industrial States, and the condition there does not differ from the condition anywhere else. Some of the mills are closed; others are running at three-quarters time; others at half time; many at quarter time, and every dollar of the loss, of course, comes out of the people who have not the opportunity to work. It has been taken from them. They are beginning to draw on their savings, and they are suffering, too, and all the manufacturing region is suffering.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish the Senator would not forget in his summary that the lead mines in Missouri are nearly all closed down, and in Oklahoma many people have been bankrupted by the fall of prices. If we are going to take care of folks, I want, at least, the lead miners of Missouri taken care of. I am not much interested in the others.

Mr. LODGE. I spoke generally of the mining industry. The Senator from Missouri has described one special case, and I suppose that the lead mines are suffering just as much as the other mines. But I was dwelling a little on the manufacturing industries of this country, because I am most familiar with them and I know what the suffering is. The people are out of work, manufacturers are all losing money, they are all obliged to cut down, and are unable to run on. They simply can not go on. But none of them have asked yet for Government help.

They, too, find it difficult to renew their credit. Some of them are failing, and I think, as a matter of justice, that we should extend aid to the manufacturing industries if we are going to aid the farmers. I think agriculture is, of course, a great basic industry. I concede all that, and if anything can be done in the legitimate way of Government aid, which will be by removing artificial obstacles or facilitating credits, guarded and safeguarded as they are in the Finance Corporation act, I think in those directions Government aid may be of value. But the Government aid at best can not arrest the progress of the great economic forces. We are passing through a very hard period, brought about by a destruction of capital property during the war such as the world has never even dreamed of.

We are fortunate here in not having a bankrupt Government. We are still solvent and sound, and there can be no greater help to the world than to keep the Government of the United States and the business of the United States solvent and sound. But it can not be done if we plunge our hands into the Treasury and take out vast sums to give to any class of people, no matter how deserving.

I should like to see a thousand million spread among the manufacturers of the North, but I know it would result in no permanent benefit. The whole of history, every law of political economy, teaches that. The salvation of this country is going to come, as it always has come, from the energy, the thrift, and the hard work of the American people. I know that is an unflattering philosophy. I know how strong the desire in the human heart is to get something for nothing; but in the long run nobody ever gets something without paying for it in some way, and we have to do it by thrift and work and energy. What is it that has carried this country to the point where it now is through peace and war? It has been the energy and determination of the American people. The bravery of our soldiers and sailors enabled us in the last war to turn the scale and win the victory, but behind the soldiers and the sailors was another great force, and that was the energy with which the American people threw themselves into that conflict, all alike—rich and poor, men and women. They all did it, and we made the decisive stroke which resulted in the winning of the war. That is what will save us now—the thrift, the energy, and the hard work of the American people—and there is no use in trying to deceive them and say they can be rescued by taking the money out of the United States Treasury and giving it to them.

From whom are you going to take it? You are going to take this money by taxation out of the people in one form or another. You say that the farmers and the agriculturists are ruined, that they are not making any money, so you must get it from the other half of the people, and they are just as badly off, exactly. With legislation of this sort you are traveling on the road to national insolvency, toward the Russian printing press; and look at Russia to-day, where they have seized all the property and spent it, and now has come the day after, and they are waking up to the impossibility of that system.

It is impossible to arrest the progress of the great forces in this way. We can help, perhaps, and I desire to help. The War Finance Corporation is doing good work now. If we can extend it so as to help the foreign trade, to help the farmers to carry their products, very well; I shall be glad to see it done. But I can not vote, Mr. President, to pass a law which shall make the United States Government responsible for a thousand million dollars in addition to what it is now carrying, when I believe firmly that it is the pursuit of a vision, that there is no reality in it. Governments can help sometimes; they can do infinite damage with bad legislation. They can sometimes do a certain amount of good with wise legislation, but they can not arrest the operation of the natural laws of this universe.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I shall occupy but a moment of the Senate's time this morning in reply to the Senator from Massachusetts in regard to the suggestion of taking the money of the American people and letting foreign countries have it in the way of producing a market for our farmers. If this bill is passed, as I hope it will be, these foreign countries will be enabled to buy some of these products which the American people now have and are unable to sell.

For instance, if through this export corporation we should send \$5,000,000 worth of produce to Belgium, Belgium would take that raw material and manufacture it and sell it to her customers and use the money to pay us for the produce purchased under this bill. Belgium can not supply her customers until she gets the raw material that we have. If we withhold that raw material she can not sell goods to people who would buy from her. We are not permitted to dispose of the produce that the farmer has ready for disposition. So, when the Government comes to his rescue at a time like this, an extraordinary time, in an emergency situation it is doing a very just and righteous thing. Of course, no one would advocate the Government going into a matter of this kind in normal times; but when an extraordinary condition like this is presented, and private capital in the country is manipulated so as to increase the distress of the people and prey upon their misfortunes, the Government, as a last resort, comes to the rescue, and it says to the great agricultural class of its people, "We will not permit the fruits of your investment and toil to be devoured by those who would fatten upon your misfortune. We will come to your rescue, because of this extraordinary situation, and we will help you to get this farm produce over yonder, and when we do that we will not only save from destruction the agricultural industry here but we will aid starving people abroad, and in helping them help ourselves."

I submit that in a case like this such action by the Congress of the United States is justified.

In this transaction the Government is not giving the farmers money. The Government will not lose a dollar. The Govern-

ment simply comes in and says to these people who have farm produce to sell, "Would you like to dispose of that?" "Yes; I'll do it. I have been waiting for somebody to come and buy." "We know where we can sell it for you," says the farm export corporation. "We have made the arrangements to sell it and we will pay you the money now if you want it. We realize the distress you are in. We realize that loans are being called and your interest rates are high, and in order to help you in the aftermath of the greatest war that ever cursed the world we do this thing. We would not do this in ordinary times, but because of the distressing and embarrassing condition that is upon the farmers of the country we invoke legislation of this kind."

I regret, Mr. President, that whenever a measure comes up here which seeks to give relief to the individual man in the country who makes up the mass of the people, there is always some learned and able argument leveled against it, against the measures that seek to extend the hand of help to the man who is down. I submit to the Senate that the individual citizen, the man who makes up the mass of the American people, is the man who is entitled to aid and to rescue at a dreadful time like this.

Wall Street, lying in the eastern section of the country, like a vampire that seizes upon the agricultural industry and sucking its life blood is getting all the money that it wants. The Federal reserve system permits it to get all the money that it wants, and that system is directly under the control of the Government. Now, then, when Congress, by some enactment, asks permission to set aside some of the common funds of the Government to go to the rescue of millions of farmers in the South and West. Senators, why can we not at a distressing time like this give that relief to them?

There is great distress in the country. That is difficult for some people to understand. It seems difficult for some Senators here to understand, Senators who do not get in touch very much, I fear, with the common mass of the common people. I fear that some of them are so far removed from the people that they really do not know how distressed millions of our people are.

You appropriate money for a great many things that could be saved to the Government, it seems to me, and here we have a proposition which will not cost the Government one cent and the purpose of the whole movement is to aid the American farmer in the hour of distress. The farmer had nothing to do with bringing about the conditions that now weigh so heavily upon him. They were thrust upon him by a shortsighted policy of the Government and by conditions world-wide that he could not control, so he is in no way responsible. The Government, the great Government of the United States, is seeking through some of us to go to his rescue and to help him upon his feet again, and by helping him help others who need his produce and without whom his produce is a drug upon the market place.

I submit, before I take my seat, that when the Government takes this step it is doing a valuable and righteous thing. It ought, it seems to me, under the peculiar circumstances to do all in its power to throw its arms around the great agricultural industry of the country and put it on its feet again. Now, Senators, the measure will be helpful to the farming interests of the country. It will be helpful to the grain growers of the West. It will be helpful to the cattlemen of the West. It will be helpful to the cotton growers of the South. It will be helpful to forty-odd millions of people in the United States. I think it ought to be voted on and passed by the Senate and sent over to the House; let the House pass it, as I believe it will, and send it to the President for his approval. Let us put into operation every agency that looks to granting aid to the people who are now in distress.

Mr. KING rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah desire to interrupt the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. KING. No, Mr. President; I thought the Senator had about concluded.

Mr. HEFLIN. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator if he desires.

Mr. KING. No; I thought the Senator from Alabama had concluded his remarks.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have no doubt the distinguished Senator from Utah wishes to address the Senate in opposition to the bill. I am not sure about that; but I believe he is anxious to do so. He looks to me like he is ready to assault the pending measure. He always makes a good speech on whatever question he discusses in this body.

Now, Senators, before I sit down I wish to say that we hear talk about renewing the loans of farmers. I wish to invite the

attention of Senators to what I fear that means. Some of them borrowed money on wheat when it was \$2 a bushel. If such a man comes up now to renew his loan, how much will he get on it? If he had borrowed \$600 on wheat at \$2 a bushel, he is better off without renewing than he is to renew at a figure fixed by a gambling exchange. The farmer who borrowed money on cotton when cotton was thirty-odd cents a pound, borrowed, say, 20 cents a pound. The New York Cotton Exchange, by an organized gambler's raid, with all the money that it needed for speculative purposes, then beat the price of cotton down to where the average price is about 8 cents a pound. What does the cotton farmer get when he comes up? He borrowed \$100 on a bale. They want to renew his loan now at \$40 a bale. Mr. President, it is necessary to watch some of the smiling Greeks when they come bearing gifts.

Now, if that situation goes on what will the farmer do? Here is what happens: "Mr. Farmer and Mr. Grain Grower, how much land have you?" "I have 360 acres." "Well, I want a mortgage on that. You can not get as much now as you did on your agricultural product before. We are going to renew your paper, but you will have to give us additional security." "Why, you ought not to require that," says the wheat farmer. "Flour is selling at a price that would justify me in getting \$2 a bushel for wheat. Cotton goods are selling at a price that would justify me," says the cotton farmer, "in demanding 40 cents a pound for cotton. Why should you accept the gambling exchange's figure upon this proposition and make me give you a mortgage on my land in addition to that which you already hold on my produce? You are making me give you a mortgage on my house and lot in addition to that."

Senators, that is what is going to happen. I hope to see the time come in this body, and come speedily, when we will have some consideration and some sympathy for this great army of farmers in America who are being herded now like cattle and their property taken from them. I wish to see the Government say to the gambling markets, "We are going to stand by this man and see that he is not robbed. We are going to stay with him through this crisis and see that he gets on his feet again." I am reminded of the old days when they gathered up corn in Egypt. They first gathered up the corn, then they brought in the money that the people had, then the land. They next took the cattle, and then they took the jewelry, and the job was complete.

Let us hope and pray that this character of aid will not be extended to the farmers of the United States.

I do not want to see the mortgages foreclosed. If that is done an army of farmers, stripped of every foot of land, stripped of a house to live in, stripped of the implements with which to work, will be seen in our country. I want Senators to think of that when they are putting out their fine-spun theories about the constitutionality of this proposition and whether it is sound and safe banking business or good business for the Government to enter into.

My sympathy goes out to these people. I am getting letters from them. I have had letters from farmers in the Northwest and in the West, and I have had them from all over the South as well, indorsing my efforts and those of others here who are seeking to aid honest, industrious farmers in their distress.

I will refer to one of those letters now. A gentleman in the Northwest wrote me a letter the other day saying that he had read my speech in which I mentioned two bankers in the South who killed themselves because they were not permitted to carry their loans. He said, "I have read your speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I can name you hundreds of instances in this section like those mentioned in your speech." He said, "I want to mention one that I know about right in this community. One of the best farmers in this section, who owned 360 acres of the best land in this part of the country, and he had personal property and was a man well to do, a fine man, of high standing, wanted to extend a loan of \$20,000. They had a mortgage on his land.

"He went to that bank that held the mortgage and tried to arrange the proposition, and the bank told him that the Federal reserve bank had called him, and under orders from that bank they would have to close him out. That situation so dazed the man that he went back home and brooded over it two or three days. This farmer had 360 acres of the finest land in that part of the country, worth, probably, ninety or one hundred thousand dollars, and considerable personal property, and yet he could not raise that \$20,000 or get his loan extended, and they were going to foreclose the mortgage. He worried and brooded over it until his mind went wrong. He murdered his wife and four children and then killed himself."

That is an awful and a grewsome picture, but it tells a tale of distress and misery prevalent in certain sections of the



country. I can name a number of instances in the South where men have killed themselves because of the financial stress and strain that was upon them, where sympathy and patience and kindly help would have saved them. I beg Senators to-day when they stand on this floor and discuss this important question to bear in mind the fact that out yonder in the States that make up this great Union there is dire distress knocking at the farmer's door and the wolves of want are howling around the cabins of the poor. There is distress, Senators, deep distress, in the country. I want Senators to bear in mind this situation when they are standing up here undertaking to block legislation that will extend the helping hand of the Government down to lift these people up out of the mud and mire into which they have been driven by a mistaken governmental policy and a misuse of governmental instrumentalities and the evil effects of a great World War.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the woeful conditions depicted by and the eloquent appeals of the Senator from Alabama, not only to-day but upon other occasions, have made such an impression upon my mind that I have come to believe that the Federal Government is so much better able to take care of the people than they are to take care of themselves that I suggest to the Senator that we transfer all we have, our possessions, our natural, political, and civil rights, as well as our lives, to the Federal Government and allow it through its bureaus and bureaucrats and Federal functionaries and Federal officials and Federal commissions and Federal agencies and instrumentalities to take us into its all-embracing arms and direct our lives, control our thoughts, and guide our faltering and feeble steps. This would seem to be the proper function of government according to the Senator from Alabama, and his various addresses would indicate that the people are so flaccid and anæmic as to be incapable of working out their own salvation.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STANLEY. Is the Senator drawing a picture of things as he would have them exist or of things that are?

Mr. KING. It is a picture of conditions that the Senator from Alabama indicates exist and that he would have exist.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator from Utah voted to take 4,000,000 American boys to send to the firing line in France, there to give their lives for the people of the United States and for the Government of the United States. Now, when private capital is profiteering upon the misfortune of the people and is waiting for them to become more unfortunate because of that situation, is the Senator not willing to let the Government use \$100,000,000 in a safe investment in order to help to lift up the people whom our boys fought over yonder to save? Does the Senator think more of \$100,000,000 of the Government's money than he does of the 4,000,000 American boys?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I was about to state that the Senator from Alabama had made such a persuasive argument that I was on the eve of suggesting that we have the Federal Government take over everything, supply money to the people, conduct their business, control their activities, and assume a complete guardianship over their lives.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. When the Senator from Utah answers the question of the Senator from Alabama will he not please tell us also where the Federal Government is going to get the hundred million dollars?

Mr. KING. Oh, well, the Senator from Alabama will turn loose the printing presses; that is what he suggested some time ago in a very able and illuminating speech submitted for our consideration.

Mr. HEFLIN. Will the Senator permit me just there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. I now desire to suggest that rather than have this slaughterhouse condition continue in the South and the West it would be better for the Government to issue

\$1,000,000,000 of Treasury notes, with \$300,000,000,000 of wealth back of them, than it would to permit the currency to be deflated and credits curtailed to the ruin of the business of America.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, of course, the Senator from Alabama is a student of economics and banking and public matters, and therefore he knows that never in the history of the Republic has there been so much banking credit as at present. Of course, as a student of public affairs and economics, the Senator also knows that never before has there been so much money in circulation in our country as at the present time or at least during the past year.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield further?

Mr. KING. First let me complete the thought I was about to express. The Senator from Alabama and I followed the views of Mr. Bryan a number of years ago when there was so much talk about the quantitative theory of money; we insisted that there was a close relation between a large volume of money and prosperity. Under that view there should be greater prosperity in the United States now than ever before because of the unprecedented amount of money in circulation. Let me say that in the interest of consistency we must still adhere to that view, a view which we advocated with so much courage and zeal—I will not say mistaken zeal—in campaigns which have been waged in this country in the past.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator from Utah refers, of course, to the campaign of 1896?

Mr. KING. Yes; and I refer also to campaigns of a later date.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am reminded—

Mr. KING. If the Senator wishes to ask a question, I will yield, but I arose only to submit a few words.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am reminded of what a man in the South at that time said. He said, "Those fellows up there where there is plenty of money, who draw their salaries each month, do not know how to sympathize with the fellows down here who can not get a dollar."

However, here is what I want to say to the Senator from Utah. The Senator has said that never before has there been so much money in circulation. Mr. President, it is a fact that there never has been a time when money was so hard to borrow as now. I want to tell the Senator from Utah what occurred at Eufaula, Ala., in my State. Ex-Representative Dent, who at one time represented the capital district of the State in Congress, told me day before yesterday that a man went to a bank with a thousand-dollar Liberty bond and could not borrow \$100 on it. So my good friend from Utah certainly is not acquainted with conditions in the country. There have been instances, one after another, where men who sought to borrow money on Liberty bonds have been turned down. They could not borrow it. Where my good friend from Utah gets all his information about money being easy and money being in circulation, I do not know. I grant that there is more money in existence to-day in the United States than ever before, but it is being cornered and held and manipulated so that it does not perform its legitimate functions. It has been perverted from the ends of its institution, and, instead of aiding the people, it is being used in such a way that it has become an instrument of torture. That is the situation. I am talking about facts as they actually exist.

Mr. KING. I am glad to have the Senator from Alabama repeat the same speech which he has made several times upon the floor. I have no doubt he will again repeat it; but it has been so persuasive—

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not know about that, but I will say to my good friend from Utah that I expect now to hear him make the same speech that he has made two dozen times.

Mr. KING. Of course, the Senator from Alabama does not speak within the realms of accuracy, because I have not addressed myself to this subject at all. This is the first announcement of my conversion to this cause so ably represented by my friend from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. I refer to other occasions.

Mr. KING. The Senator has become so used to talking about this lugubrious situation that he forgets what transpires. Of course, the Senator's statements are mere verbal inexactitudes, that is all; but I was about to say that I have been so persuaded by the admirable, eloquent, appealing, pathetic, and tragic argument of the Senator from Alabama that I am about

to join his school of political thought; in fact, I am going to go a little further than he and urge that the Government take all of us over, provide all with money, start the printing presses, and flood the land with promises to pay. The Government is omnipotent. It can touch the people with its divine hand, and heal their infirmities, and cure their ills, political and economic. In olden times persons sought the king's touch to cure them of scrofula and other disorders. Let us only be able to touch the magic robe of governmental authority, and we will be relieved of all our woes. The Senator from Alabama and his school—and I think I will have to join it—believe that the king's touch—that is, the touch of the Federal Government—will cure all economic ills.

What is the good of having private property and homes and the institutions of Christian civilization? What is the good of private initiative? What is the good of thrift and energy and courage and other splendid virtues that have made the American people the greatest in the world and our Government the finest that the genius of man and the mercies of God has ever produced for the blessing of mankind? It is all an illusion, a dream. Let the Federal Government take over everything; let the Federal Government take care of us. If we are sick, the Federal Government will cure us; if we have mental disorders, the Federal Government will minister to us; if we have nothing in our pockets, if we can not put money in our purses, as Shakespeare bade us to do, the Federal Government will do it all—it will fill our lives with joy and our purses with fiat paper money. The millennial era will come if we will only rely upon the Government instead of ourselves and our own energy and latent powers.

So, Mr. President, I suggest that the Federal Government not only give money to the farmers but give it to the men in the West whose mines are closed down; give it to the sheep men whose wool has not been sold for two years; give it to all who have met with adversity and misfortune. There are millions of men out of employment, men of courage, men who would like an opportunity to work. Let us coin, or, rather, make, paper money from their bone and their brawn and their brains and give them money. Why not? Let them knock at the counter of the Government and receive in return for their notes, based upon brain and brawn and desire for work, the money which they require to meet the imperative necessities of life. Of course, the money so issued may have no value; it may be as worthless as were the French assignats issued during the French Revolution or the currency issued by the bolsheviks of Russia.

If it possesses value, then it must be backed by the taxing power of the State, and millions more must be wrung from the people by oppressive and destructive taxation.

Mr. President, I appreciate the serious industrial and financial condition existing not only in the United States but in all the world. I would be most happy to see universal peace and prosperity and the clouds of economic depression vanished from the sky. But statutes and decrees will not meet the situation.

The school of political thought to which the Senator belongs seems to regard the individual as the child of the State instead of the State as the agent of the individual. Under this view it becomes the creator and the dispenser of bounties and benefactions, and the multitudes are permitted to exist as visible objects of its generosity.

The theory is not new. In ancient times people looked to the State for guidance and direction. It determined their pursuits, fixed their status, prescribed their wage by rescript or autocratic proclamation, and determined the value of the products of their toil. It not only controlled their political, but, if I may express it, their material lives; and it also directed their intellectual and their spiritual activities. It prescribed what they should read and proscribed what it forbade them to learn. It controlled conscience, imposed religious rites and forms and ceremonies, and with lavish hand at times bestowed gifts upon the people; but more frequently with iron rule it placed the yoke of servitude upon them. The struggle has been through the ages to emancipate humanity from tyranny and paternalism and deadly bureaucracies, to give to the individual the scepter of authority and power, and to make him the arbiter of his own destiny.

This Republic was consecrated to this more than human—indeed, this divine task—and under the principles of Jefferson announced in the Declaration of Independence, and developed in the institutional life of our Republic, there has been produced a mighty race who have met the problems of modern life with their complications and perplexities, and raised to a standard never before attained, 100,000,000 patriotic and progressive people. A benevolent paternalism may survive for the moment, but it perishes; destroyed either because of the devitalization

which it produces or because ambitious and often patriotic individuals prefer either a stronger form of government or one in which the individual is the source of power which is exercised in the establishment of an enlightened representative government.

The ideas, Mr. President, that Jackson and Jefferson and the founders of the Republic, and particularly of the Democratic Party, taught are all wrong. Jefferson was wrong and Jackson was wrong, irretrievably wrong, when they insisted that the General Government was one of delegated powers; that its authority was not plenary but limited; that it could coin such gold and silver as might be presented at the mint; and tax the people only for the maintenance of the Government. They had seen the evils of paper issues by States and the Continental Congress, and they contended for a safe and sound fiscal system. Of course, they were wrong when they proclaimed a limitation upon the functions and powers of the Federal Government, and when they announced their theory of the powers and duties of governments, and proclaimed their view upon political economy. They were wrong in putting links into the jaws of Government, in crowning the individual, in emphasizing the necessity of character and thrift and energy and those sterling qualities that have manifested themselves to such a preeminent degree in the Anglo-Saxon race. Let us abandon their archaic and provincial views and creeds; let us preach the doctrine of impotency, of individual devitalization, of State decadence, and absolutism. Let us confess that we are a sort of protoplasmic mass, responsive only to Federal stimuli; that there is no individuality; that the Government must protect us and feed us and clothe us and put money into our purses and provide us with work and control all business. If we produce, the Government must take our products, find us markets, secure purchasers, and fix prices; indeed, we must go back to the days of the past, when governments were supreme, when the destroyers of Rome robbed the people of their independence and made them spineless and nerveless, fit only for slavery under despotic masters.

So I am going to join the school of my friend, and when the proper time comes in the consideration of this bill I am going to offer an amendment providing that the Government shall loan money to the workingmen; that it shall take care of the lead producers and the copper producers and everybody who is in want, for, of course, that is the function of the Government; and having accepted that school of philosophy and established the proposition that the Government is an eleemosynary institution and the fountain of our existence, let us look to it to fructify the arid wastes of life and abolish all the economic and social ills to which flesh is heir.

So I say to my friend that I hope to offer such an amendment, and I shall expect him to speak for it, of course. He is the champion of the people, the great tribune of the downtrodden. He is—I was going to say the modern Don Quixote, but of course I will not do so—he is a brave, chivalrous man, and will smite the dragon that is destroying the lives and the business and the prosperity and the independence of the American people. May I be permitted to be an humble follower in the ranks of the great party which the distinguished Senator from Alabama is about to organize?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, in reply to my good friend from Utah [Mr. KING], who is so far removed from the cry of distress that we hear amongst the masses, I want to remind him that the Government of the United States, this great, free, constitutional Government of America, stepped down off of its high pedestal of noninterference with private business and during the war insured the lives of its soldiers. Every one of them who wished a policy got it. The life insurance companies of America had the Government set up in competition with them, by the aid, I think, of the Senator from Utah. Not only that, Mr. President, but this great Government insured cargoes of goods. Common merchandise placed in the bottoms of American ships, flying the American flag, going into the various ports of the earth, had back of it insurance policies written by the Government of the United States. That was an emergency situation. That condition was brought about because of the war, and this condition that I speak of to-day is in part the fruit of horrible, hateful war.

We went to the rescue of the man who had the merchandise to sell during the war, and we took the risk, and backed that risk with the American Navy, with the lives of the American marines, to protect that cargo to the place of its destination. It was all right for the Government to enter into private business then. When we insured the lives of soldiers and stepped across the path of the private insurance companies of America that was all right then. Now, in the aftermath of that war, when we see all around us the distressed agricultural army of



America that produced the food upon which our soldiers lived and the Allies lived, and that enabled us to win the war, the Senator gets up and makes light of arguments that are being made to save these people from financial disaster and their families from starvation. I am sure that he does not understand the meaning and purpose of this bill.

He intimates that I want to take the Government and turn it over to people in distress. He talks about these people as though they were a lot of loafers, who because of their inactivity, their indolence, and their lack of thrift and enterprise that we are seeking to go to their rescue. That is not my position. I am seeking to go to the rescue of the bone and sinew of this Nation. I am seeking to go to the rescue of men who are engaged in an industry which is at the very bottom of life itself. Destroy your farmer, and you destroy human life. But for him we could not live. He produces the bread and the meat that we eat. It is this great productive class, this great agricultural army, in whose name I plead to-day, that I ask for legislation that will not cost the Government a dollar, but which will greatly benefit the agricultural interests of our country.

I want to remind the Senator that on one occasion a long time ago, when man thought more of money than he did of his fellow man, when money lenders were feeding upon the substance of the poor, and men, as some do now, worshipped the god of gold, the great Father of us all said: "I will make a man more precious than gold." I commend this scripture to my friend from Utah. I am for using some of the Government's gold in the efforts to save from disaster and ruin the loyal and industrious farmers of the Government. I am not talking about taking the Government's money and throwing it out to a bunch of bolshevists who hate my Government and would tear down its flag.

I am not speaking in the interest of anarchists, who would overthrow the Government that I love. I am pleading for those who fought to sustain it in the hour of its peril, produced food to feed its Army, and sent their boys to save its life on the battle fields of France.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Has the Senator from Alabama carefully read this bill?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes, sir. I helped to report it out of the committee. I think the report was unanimous. I know they say that manufacturers can come in under it. If the millman who grinds wheat into flour, if the cottonseed-oil man who makes cottonseed meal out of cotton seed and the oil out of the seed, want to sell that manufactured product to these people, why, let them do it.

If you confined it to raw cotton seed we could not export cottonseed oil and cottonseed meal and we could not export flour, because these would be in the manufactured state. I would not confine them strictly to the raw material as we understand that term. So, Mr. President, we thought this all out. We believed that this agency would do good. I am still of the opinion that it will do good, and I am supporting it.

I want to say to my friend from Utah one other thing. Here is the situation that is presented: The farmer had the price of his produce beaten down and down by an army of bear gamblers on the grain and cotton exchanges. Now, keep that in mind. Wheat is \$1 a bushel under what it was when this crash came. Cotton is 30 cents a pound under what it was when the crash came. Now, let us see. Look on the farmer out there in the South and out here in the West, and what do you observe?

"Mr. Farmer of the West, is your produce going up or down in value?"

"Oh, away down; below the cost of production."

"Mr. Farmer of the South, is your produce going up or down?"

"Away down; under the cost of production."

"How about money that used to meet you in the market place?"

"That has gone up."

"Where is the fellow who has the money?"

"There he is; in Wall Street, hugging it to his bosom."

"What is happening to it?"

"The interest rate on that is going up. The value of the farm produce, he is beating that down."

Would the Senator from Utah want to occupy the position of permitting that situation to exist, where the Government will

permit one man to enhance the value of his money which is given in exchange for the produce of another while the produce, which represents the farmer's property, is being driven down in price?

I put that proposition to my friend from Utah.

Sensors, you have got to answer these propositions. You have got to answer them somewhere else besides here, too, because the American people have their eyes on this Congress, and they have a right to have their eyes on it. What is the Congress? We are the servants of the people. We are the Congress of the people. They have a right to look upon Congress and scrutinize it very carefully, and I hope they will do it every day. They are entitled to see what we are doing. We are here to legislate in the interest of the American people.

I do not want Wall Street to dictate the policies of the American Congress. I am an ardent Democrat. I believe that my party holds the right solution for all the problems that affect the people, but I am going to vote with my friends from the West on this proposition. Together we reported the bill. Democrats and Republicans should stand together on this measure. We should wipe out party lines, Mr. President, when it comes to a matter of going to the rescue of millions of American people in distress. I repeat, values falling all around them and interest rates climbing up. Money? You can not borrow it on Liberty bonds in order to hold produce until it brings a price that will cover the cost of production, but you can get all you want for Wall Street to beat down the price of farm products.

In view of the distressing conditions that now afflict our farmers, let us pass this bill and aid him in obtaining a market for his produce.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, it had not been my intention at all to say a word about this bill or any other bill to-day. I did have in preparation an address which I expected to deliver to the Senate on somewhat a similar line, intended for the general relief of the country.

It is no mere formal use of words, Mr. President, when I assure the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] that I hold him in the highest respect and in the warmest affection; but in the ardency of his desire to do something to relieve the farming class he is very much like a doctor might be who becomes excited and prescribes a remedy which would aggravate the disease instead of curing it.

For a long, long time I have devoted much thought to the question of finance and to almost every question of political economy. I may be rusty in a great many branches of them; it has been a long time since I refreshed my memory by reference to books; but, like learning A B C's, or learning how to play a fiddle, we never entirely forget; and, while the details may escape me, I think I can in the main track the line and how to it with some accuracy.

A few years ago, as I reminded my friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], there was a surplus crop of coffee in Brazil. In that country, as I remember it, the Government has a monopoly of that business, as the Government of France used to have a monopoly of salt, and as various other Governments have had and still have monopolies on certain articles. The Government of Brazil, knowing that there was an overproduction of coffee, deliberately removed from the market one-half of the production, leaving to be sold in this and other countries the normal amount, thereby obtaining the usual price, and the part which had been removed from the market was gradually sifted back onto the market as the market required it. Thus the natural law of supply and demand prevailed, and the coffee planters of Brazil escaped the ruin which now faces the cotton planters of the South and the wheat planters of the West.

We can not afford to rush heedlessly to the support of every bill that is offered here in the name of the relief of the farmer. We can not be blind to the fact that quack remedies prevail in legislatures as they do in the practice of medicine. We must examine upon its own merits every bill that is offered to us, and if we find that the bill is a dangerous one, unconstitutional, abortive, necessarily bound to be a failure, then, if we have that conviction, we must be as honest in expressing it as the honest Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] has been in expressing an opinion to the contrary.

Now, what are the demerits and the dangers of this bill? In the first place, it seeks to set up another governmental bureau, another department, when, as every Senator is well aware, we have at least as many bureaus and departments now as this Government ought to have. We are daily scandalized by the accusations made against these various boards and bureaus and departments. We were at work yesterday in trying to consolidate several different bureaus and boards into one, because

there had been complaint from one end of the country to the other about the mismanagement of those bureaus and boards.

We are now staggered by the statements made by Chairman Lasker, of the Shipping Board, that not only did the former board squander four thousand million dollars, which were wrung from the people, in the purchase of so-called Liberty bonds, but that he will have to come to Congress and ask for \$300,000,000 more; and we are also aware of the fact that, while, in the main a new board has been appointed, the chairman of the old board has been retained, without reprimand, without rebuke, without punishment, and we do not know what kind of men have been associated with him in the new board.

Mr. CARAWAY. The old chairman was from the Senator's State.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. The Senator from Arkansas reminds me that Admiral Benson was from my State. I welcome the interruption. He left the State some forty-odd years ago, and he did not leave the State a bit poorer when he left it. We have managed to progress without him, and we did not like it very much when he was charged up to the State of Georgia, in which he had not had his washing done for the last 40 or 50 years.

Now, Mr. President, what are some of the main dangers of this bill? It is called a bill "To provide for the purchase of farm products." That is the title. Should not the contents of the bill conform to the title? They do not do so. We have a great deal to do with the Anti-Saloon League, and there is not a saloon in the United States. It is a misnomer. It is an anachronism. In section 9 of this bill it is provided—

That the corporation shall be empowered and authorized to buy agricultural products either in their natural state or prepared or manufactured from any person within the United States.

If that does not mean everything from your shoes to your hat, tell me what it exempts?

If that does not include almost everything that you put in your house, outside of wooden and metallic furniture, tell me what it is. Under that clause you can go to W. L. Douglas and buy up every shoe he manufactures for a whole year. You can go to a tannery and contract for every hide that is tanned for use during the whole year. You can go to a dry-goods store and buy it out, from the mercerized goods to the gingham and the balbriggans. Under that clause you can buy almost anything that the seller will offer at prices which are attractive to this corporation buyer, and there is absolutely no veto upon the trade.

The Senator from Alabama, who speaks with so much feeling on the subject, a feeling with which I have so much sympathy, has in his mind the raw wheat and the raw cotton. The bill is different. Under this bill you can go to a bakery and buy every loaf of bread and every poundcake that is in that bakery, and you need not buy a single bushel of wheat.

Therefore the bill does not conform to its title, and surely the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who is as honest a gentleman as lives, never intended to bring a bill in here which said one thing in its title and said another thing in its provisions.

This bill authorizes this tremendously powerful corporation to act as agent for any person producing or dealing in such products. This tremendously powerful corporation backed by the United States Government, with the guaranty of the Government for its debts, can act as agent for any speculative gambler on Wall Street. I call the attention of my friend from Alabama to that fact.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GLASS in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. Before the Senator gets away from his statement that the title to the bill is misleading, let me call his attention to the fact that it says—

To provide for the purchase of farm products in the United States, to sell the same in foreign countries, and for other purposes.

Will the Senator tell us where the discrepancy is between that and section 9, which provides, "that the corporation shall be empowered and authorized to buy agricultural products," and nothing else? Is there any distinction in the Senator's mind between farm products and agricultural products?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. There may be considerable differences between what are usually understood as farm products and what are usually understood as agricultural products.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the Senator tell us what the difference is between a farm product and an agricultural product?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Let us see. In one section, like Kansas, or in Missouri, for instance, the production of mules

may be the principal industry of a farm, and, I believe, in some parts of those States it is; but you can not class them with wheat and bales of cotton.

Mr. CARAWAY. Neither could you call a mule an agricultural product, could you?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. You might, if you called him a farm product. He is produced on the farm. If you do not produce him on the farm, where do you produce him?

Mr. CARAWAY. You usually produce him on the range, in Missouri.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. What is a range but a farm on a large scale?

Mr. CARAWAY. No; it is outdoors, where it has not been cleared.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. So is a farm outdoors. I have never seen a farm inside the house.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is a woodland a farm?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. No; it is not a farm; but you can not raise mules in the woods.

Mr. CARAWAY. You never raised a mule; that is certain.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I have raised mules and I have raised horses, but I did not raise them in the woods.

Mr. CARAWAY. In Georgia is a mule considered a farm product?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. We do not raise mules in Georgia for sale, except in rare cases, where we raise them on our meadows.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is he a farm product in Georgia?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. When he is raised on a farm, is he not a farm product, like a calf, or a pig, or a lamb?

Mr. CARAWAY. I am asking the Senator seriously if he classes a mule as a farm product?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I am asking the Senator just as seriously what he classes him under, if he does not class him as a farm product?

Mr. CARAWAY. He is an animal.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. What sort of a product is he?

Mr. CARAWAY. He is an animal, and certainly if he is included in the words "farm products" in the title of the bill, providing for the purchase of farm products, if he is a farm product, then there is not any distinction between the title to the bill and what is included in section 9. That is all I asked the Senator from Georgia to tell us. It is charged by the Senator from Georgia that the bill is not on its face quite square, as in its title it says "to provide for the purchase of farm products," and in section 9 provides for the purchase of agricultural products. I would like to know the difference between those terms.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Taking the words of the bill, What is a mule "in his manufactured state"?

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not know what he is. I never saw it. But that does not answer the question.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Under the bill the corporation is "empowered and authorized to buy agricultural products, either in their natural state or prepared or manufactured." How do you go about manufacturing a mule?

Mr. CARAWAY. If he was a white mule, I rather think in Georgia they would put him in a still.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I never saw a white mule. I could answer that a little more personally, but it would not be courteous to the Senator from Arkansas.

As I said, this great corporation can become a vast brokerage with which no other broker could compete, and therefore this brokerage would be a governmental monopoly. If there is any one thing we do not want in this country, it is a monopoly of any kind; and, if there is any one thing we are trying to get rid of, it is monopoly.

Again:

3. To make advances for the purpose of assisting in financing the exportation of agricultural products upon such terms and subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the board of directors of the corporation.

How many 1-horse farmers, raising from three to six bales of cotton, want to turn those bales of cotton over to a big non-resident corporation to export into foreign countries and take their chances? He needs the money right then. He needs it as soon as he can get the cotton to market. If the buyer is on the platform, the cotton is weighed and sold right there, or he borrows money from his local banker on it right there. Not one farmer in a million would want to send his three or six bales of cotton to Germany or Poland or Siberia or anywhere else to await the pleasure of this corporation.

Then comes a queer provision—

But in no case shall any of the moneys so advanced be sent without the United States.



It would take an army of spies to enforce that provision. When you put money into the pocket of a purchaser, of an agent, or of an exporter, how on earth can you follow the money in the pocketbook of that man, and say where he shall spend it? What right have you to do that? It is either his or it is not. If it is not his, it ought not to be in his purse; it ought to be in yours. If it is his, he has a right to spend it when and how and where he pleases.

Again, every such advance shall be secured by adequate security, and the board shall be judge of it. One man of the board may say it is adequate, and another one may say it is not. A majority, of course, will decide, but the security that is adequate one day may be inadequate the next day. The securities may fluctuate on the market. Unless you put it down into something that is fixed and stable, it will fluctuate, and every business man knows it. We would not have market reports every day in the papers if values did not fluctuate. You can hardly put your money into anything that does not fluctuate. Even Government bonds do it.

The rate of interest is left indefinite.

Section 12 says that these securities, these bonds, shall be exempt from taxation. There is a growing feeling all over the country that the great principle of uniform and equal taxation is slipping away from us. There are some few men who pay the taxes, the men who can not hide their horses and mules and land, the men who can not hide their visible property; but the men who have the notes, the checks, the shares of stock, the bonds, the mortgages, the trust deeds, have only to hire a lock box in some bank or trust company, and the tax receiver does not put his hands on them. They escape taxation. It is proposed that this enormously powerful corporation shall be another tax-exempt proposition.

It is too plain a proposition to need more than the bare statement that, our expenses of Government being fixed, even being on the increase, we add to the taxes of those who pay the taxes when we increase the number of those who do not pay taxes.

Again:

SECTION 13. That the United States shall be liable for the payment of all bonds and other obligations, together with interest thereon, issued by the corporation.

Is not the farmer a part of the United States Government? The very class which you propose to relieve is made indorser and security for the very bonds which this enormous corporation will issue. How will the farmer like that? Suppose the corporation gets into a colossal wreckage like our Shipping Board, upon whom will the losses fall? They will fall upon the common taxpayer who can not hide his horse, who can not hide his mules, who can not hide his wagon, who can not hide his cow, who can not hide his household furniture, who can not hide his farm. They will fall on him, and they will fall like the palace fell upon the strong man who pulled it down upon himself in order to destroy his enemies.

Section 17 is objectionable. It authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission to give special preferential rates to this one corporation. The other day we had the coal bill here, presented by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], who very eloquently advocated its passage. One of the objectionable features in that bill was that in a part of the year the Interstate Commerce Commission might grant reduced rates. In this bill the Interstate Commerce Commission is virtually directed to give reduced freight rates and to give special privilege to this speculative corporation which may be acting for the gamblers of Wall Street or New Orleans.

Who is it that dares say what will be the natural consequences of such an act? Who is it that does not remember how the Standard Oil Co. built itself up on preferential freight rates and killed its competitors? No corporation or individual, no town or city, no community or State which enjoys a freight rate not enjoyed by its competitors will have to go out of business, and every Senator in this Chamber knows it. We have had too many illustrations of it. The bill gives it to this enormous corporation, which is not controlled by anybody except by the haphazard and perhaps unconsidered confirmation of two men by the United States Senate.

I had noticed, but was not intending to comment upon section 18 as it now stands in the bill, the corporation may arrange with the United States Shipping Board for reduced freight rates for the transportation of such products by water and that the Shipping Board shall carry such products in ships operated by such board at cost whenever it can do so in any of its vessels not otherwise engaged.

Talk about special privilege! We have the tin-plate queen, with her tariff-made fortune, now controlling the destinies of Greece and financing the war in Asia Minor. We have tariff-protected barons all over this Union, and Senators say here on

the floor of the United States Senate that their lobby is here to control legislation. What we do know is that they control the prices of the necessities of life and tax everybody, from the common workman up to the great man in the White House, every man from the hut to the palace, and yet here we deliberately create another such monopoly upon the mistaken idea that it will not do what all other monopolies have done.

I will say by way of closing that the farmers of the country know perfectly well that they have not a friend in this Chamber who will fight for them more quickly and more stubbornly than I will, but the measure as proposed must be one that meets my judgment. They know perfectly well that I will tell them frankly and tell them boldly when a bill proposed here is one which, in the long run, I think will do them more harm than good.

Mr. BORAH obtained the floor.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator desire to discuss the pending bill?

Mr. CARAWAY. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Very well. I was going to discuss another subject, but I do not wish to interfere with the discussion of this particular bill.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I shall occupy the time of the Senate but a short time. I do not believe the bill now before the Senate will do all that its proponents claim for it. I am not so certain that it will do any of the things which those who stand for it hope. But if it is to be defeated, it should be defeated upon its provisions and not by the distortion of its enemies.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. WARREN], I believe, will find that the farmers know more than they used to know when, as he boasts, they were willing to accept his statement that the measure was either good or bad.

To profess to believe the proposed corporation is one that may grow and grow until it consumes the country after the manner of the Standard Oil Co. is idle. The Senator from Georgia knows, if he has read the bill, that this corporation will not be a speculative corporation at all, as he designated it. It will not be a profit-making corporation; it will not pay a cent of dividends to anyone. It will not be organized for that purpose. It will simply be an agent of the Government. It would be just as proper and quite as accurate to say that the Treasury was a great corporation organized for profit, and that it might consume the country. There is not a dollar's worth of private profit that can come out of the proposed corporation to the benefit of any man connected with it. Therefore, when the Senator talks about it being a speculative corporation and in the interests of Wall Street, I am sure the Senator is being facetious. Certainly he can not afford to make seriously such a statement.

The proposed bill provides that the work proposed shall be carried on through a commission—a commission consisting of the Secretary of Agriculture and two others. It is not any argument to say that some existing commissions or boards have not discharged their duties wisely. It would be just as proper to say that we shall abolish governments because governments have made mistakes as to say that because one board has not functioned wisely no other board ever will. That is not more wisdom to show that the Shipping Board has not done all that its friends hoped of it, and thus use that as an argument against this measure, than it would be for those who oppose organized governments to say that because in certain aspects governments have failed we should therefore have no governments at all.

Certainly there is no good argument against the principle of this bill to say that it is not responsive to its title, as the Senator from Georgia undertook to show because in one place it used the words "agricultural products" and in another the words "farm products." The Senator from Georgia would not undertake to define the difference, because there is not any. I have always held it true that if there were a real objection to a measure those opposed to it do not have to indulge in subterfuge, that they did not have to bring forward false analogies in order to establish their good faith in their opposition to it. I can conceive that Senators may be opposed to the formation of agencies which impose governmental interference in private business. I share those prejudices, but these are extraordinary times and conditions. I was particularly impressed by a statement made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], who the other day asserted that farmers were not any worse off financially than other people were. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] repeated that statement to-day and, continuing, said the mill people, the manufacturing people, the industrial people of New England, were as badly off as were the agricultural people of the South and West. I do not doubt that both

Senators believe what they said; I am not questioning that; but Senators know we are a peculiar people. We are affected or influenced by local conditions, for instance.

I live a good long way south of here and two or three times I have made the mistake on leaving home, because it was warm there, of believing that it was warm everywhere and came here wearing a Palm Beach suit, and upon arriving found it cold enough for a snowstorm here. I had failed to realize that there were a thousand miles of distance between the two sections. I have also seen gentlemen from New England, with all their wisdom, come down to my section of the country wearing fur overcoats when they needed Palm Beach suits and palm-leaf fans. They could not realize that there were two sections of this country, so much are all of us swayed by local conditions. Thus also, legislatively speaking, we fail to see all sections of our country.

I do know, however—and I am willing to submit the figures, and not merely what I personally know and realize—that agriculture, and I am now speaking of agriculture as it is conducted in the South and West, is infinitely worse off than is any other industry in this country at the present time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas permit an interruption?

Mr. CARAWAY. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator from Arkansas is in error in regard to what I said. I certainly did not intend to say that agriculture was not suffering.

Mr. CARAWAY. No; the Senator from Missouri did not say that; but he said that agriculture was not more seriously crippled than were other industries.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator is in error about that. If I said that, I did not intend to say it. I think agriculture is, generally speaking, in a worse condition just now than are any other industries.

Mr. CARAWAY. As I understood the Senator from Missouri—and if I am wrong I wish to be set right—he said that agriculture was crippled but not seriously so; that the farmers were not “broke”; that the farmers were not any worse off than were other people. That is what I understood the Senator to say.

I have in my hand here a recent tabulation from a bulletin of the Census Bureau which shows that the mortgage indebtedness of the farmers in this country—and that includes them all—has increased 132 per cent in the last 10 years. The mortgages have not only increased in numbers, but they have increased in amounts. The mortgage indebtedness of the farmers of the State of the Senator from Missouri has increased 145 per cent in 10 years. In the State of Arkansas, which I have the honor in part to represent, farm mortgages have increased 148 per cent. I venture to assert that there is no other industry in the country that will show a like increase of mortgage indebtedness in that length of time. That, too, notwithstanding the fact that the farmer is the most conservative man on earth; he never mortgages his farm so long as he has any other asset on which he can raise money. The fact that practically every farm in America to-day is mortgaged is conclusive proof that every farmer in America is bankrupt to-day, because his farm is the last of his assets that he puts in pawn.

If I may be permitted to refer to the people of my particular section, for I know their conditions there—ours is a cotton-growing section. I know men who in 1919 were worth anywhere from \$100,000 to \$500,000 who are in bankruptcy to-day. Those are not merely isolated cases. There is not a solvent institution in any cotton-growing State in the South to-day. There is not a bank whose doors could not be closed if it were compelled to realize on the securities, based on agricultural products, which it now holds. There is not a planter in my section, with one or two exceptions, of whom I know who could pay his debts to-day, or who could even pay his taxes without borrowing.

There is absolute ruin, an absolute dearth of credit; and there is not any more prospect of their recovering this year or next year or the year after than there is of the Senator from Georgia finally getting right on what constitutes “agricultural products” and what constitutes “farm products”; both are absolutely impossible.

I realize that this is special legislation; but every Senator who has opposed it except one—and he was not present at the time—voted for special favors for the railroads. I am not falling out with them about that; but more money was given to the railroads than this bill even contemplates loaning to the farmers. Furthermore, to the railroads there was an absolute gift, but under this bill not a 5-cent piece is to be given to anybody. No farmer will get a penny under this bill for

which he will not have to give full value. There is to be no gift; to call it such is a misnomer; it is an absolute slander to say that this bill undertakes to give to the farmer anything. It does nothing except to furnish him an agency through which he may sell his surplus products. That is its purpose, and everybody understands it.

We must all live by agriculture. There is not a Senator in this Chamber that does not depend upon agriculture for his daily bread and the clothes that he wears. Since the farmer's product is used by everybody, by every man, woman, and child, then anything that enables the farmer to produce benefits every man, woman, and child; and, therefore, this bill is not class legislation. To say that legislation that enables the farmer to produce is class legislation is to state that which is not a fact, and everyone knows it. However, if it were, this Government has been committed to that policy ever since it was organized. We have given away millions and millions of acres of land in the public domain—for what purpose? In order to induce men to go on the land, to clear the land, to become farmers, to become producers, so that the whole country might benefit. I repeat we have been committed to that policy always, and nobody has ever complained until it was proposed to help the farmer get from under the hand of the speculator who is crushing out his very life at this time.

As I have said before, I am not so enthusiastic about this bill as some Senators are. I am not so certain that it is going to benefit anybody. I do not know what securities the countries may have to which we expect to export agricultural products. I do not know whether or not they can secure the advances that are expected in order to sell them our farm products. If they can not, they will not get the products; that is all.

If it were not a serious matter, it would be rather a joke to hear the Senator from Georgia stand here and proclaim, as I heard him proclaim the other day—and he said he was a constitutional lawyer and had argued the Constitution from justice of the peace courts up to the supreme court of his State—that the provision of the bill which I am about to read would be a nullity. That provision reads:

Every such advance shall be secured by adequate security of such character as shall be prescribed by the board of directors of a value at the time of such advances—as estimated and determined by the board of directors—equal to at least 100 per cent of the amount advanced by the corporation.

The Senator from Georgia said that would be a nullity, because nobody would know what the securities might be worth; that they may be worth more to-day than they will be worth to-morrow. I will remind the Senator that same condition confronts every man who does business. Every banker who loans a dollar is confronted with that condition; everybody who deals with another when credit is extended must know that the securities may depreciate in value.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas wants to be fair.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I am certain about it, or I would not say so. I did not make the statement that the provision was a nullity. I said it was unwise to give the unlimited right to name the security.

Since the Senator has mentioned constitutional law, which I did not bring in at all in that particular connection—

Mr. CARAWAY. If the Senator will pardon me, the statement I had in mind in making that reference was that of agency, which I was just about reaching.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I did not make any constitutional point as to that provision.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes. To go back a little, as to the provision in the bill reading as follows:

(3) To make advances for the purpose of assisting in financing the exportation of agricultural products upon such terms and subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the board of directors of the corporation, to any person producing such products within the United States, or to any person, government, or subdivision of government without the United States purchasing such products, but in no case shall any of the moneys so advanced be expended without the United States—

The Senator said that we had no power to do that; that after we turned the money over to the other person it was his money, and he could do what he pleased with it.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I said that as a matter of individual liberty. I did not mention constitutional law at all. But since the Senator has mentioned constitutional law I will ask him whether he does not think that the provision beginning with line 21 and reading “The corporation shall retain the



power to require additional security at any time" would not be an impairment of a contract after a contract was made?

Mr. CARAWAY. No, sir.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Does the Senator think anybody would ever make a contract with any such provision in it?

Mr. CARAWAY. If the Senator ever borrowed money from a bank, he submitted himself to just exactly that condition.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I have borrowed a great deal from banks, but I never had to submit to that condition.

Mr. CARAWAY. It is not at all uncommon in my section of the country for the banker to call the borrower in and say, "This man whose name is on your paper I thought was good, but I am losing confidence in him; you will have to get somebody else to sign your note." That has happened so frequently to me and other people I know that nobody ever thought of questioning it. The proposed agricultural corporation is going to make advances through agents of its own in order to sell farm products, and if in its attempt to sell it decides that, although it has accepted a contract, the security under the contract is not good, it can refuse to deliver, just as may be done by any merchant who ships goods.

A wholesale merchant may sell an order of goods to a merchant living in Washington; the wholesale merchant, we will say, lives in Baltimore. He may deliver the goods to the railroad to be delivered to the merchant here in Washington and decide that the credit was ill-extended, the security not sufficient, or for any other reason, and stop the goods in transit and take them back, notwithstanding the courts have said over and over and over again that delivery to the common carrier is a delivery to the purchaser, and yet you can stop them in transit. There is not any question about that.

Then, coming back to the provision of the bill of which the Senator complains—that we could not stipulate that the agent should expend the money within the United States—it is a very common thing indeed where an agency is employed to prescribe under what conditions the agent may exercise his delegated authority. Why, if a farmer goes to the Federal farm loan bank and borrows money now under a law that is on the statute books he is required to use that money for certain specific purposes, and if he does not do so it is a violation of his contract and the money can be withheld from him, or he can be compelled immediately to return it to the Government, because it was loaned to him upon condition that he use it for purchasing a home, for paying off a mortgage debt of a home already purchased, or for certain improvements, and if he uses it for any other purpose he voids his contract. If these people here who accept the credit of this corporation to buy farm products were to go to Canada or to go to Australia or to any other country and buy farm products, it would be a violation of their contract, and their right to act for the corporation would end, and they would be compelled to return the money. There is not anything strange, there is not anything uncommon, there is not anything at all unreasonable in that provision.

Now, I do not know—and I am going to hurry to get through, in order that I may yield the floor to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]—whether a dollar's worth of farm products will be exported under this bill. When I voted to rehabilitate the War Finance Corporation I did not know that it would be able to do any good. I heard a great many very learned men say that it was purely a war agency and had no place in the Government in times of peace, that it would not be useful, and therefore they opposed its rehabilitation just as vigorously as the Senator from Georgia opposes this.

I do know, however, and everybody knows that the War Finance Corporation has been useful, immensely useful, but most useful to the manufacturer and the merchant. It has been of very little use, comparatively speaking, to the farmer. Now, here is a bill that comes into the Senate that is intended to be useful to the farmer, if useful to anybody, to perform for the farmer the same functions that the War Finance Corporation performed for the manufacturer; and now we hear these representatives from the industrial States say that it was all right to revive the War Finance Corporation, because they could use it; but as for the farmer, "Why, God bless him, he has always gotten on without us, and let him do without us still."

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. EDGE. I think I heard the Senator remark just a moment ago that while the War Finance Corporation had been a benefit, it was chiefly a benefit to the manufacturer and to the industrial concern. Does not the Senator know that at least since the War Finance Corporation was rejuvenated the last time, according to the report of its activities—I think I am correct in the figures—from 70 to 80 per cent of the money advanced has been for agricultural products?

Mr. CARAWAY. No; I think the Senator is wrong about that. As to the tentative advancements—that is, agreements upon which advancements are expected to be made at some time in the future—that may be true; but hardly a dollar of War Finance Corporation money has yet gone to farmers. It has been used in some instances to export farm products, but it has been used in the interest of men who have acquired those farm products and not to take the farm products from the farmer himself. Now, I saw—and the Senator from New Jersey evidently referred to it—a statement that so many million dollars had been loaned to some people to export long-staple cotton from Mississippi.

Not a bale of that cotton was owned by a man living in Mississippi, as I understand, but it was financing a lot of cotton brokers in the city of Memphis, Tenn. I am not falling out with the War Finance Corporation for doing that. I think any means that enables people here to get rid of their surplus farm products, so that they may be protected in the future, is a wise provision, and I am not raising the question as to whether heretofore business has profited more by legislation than farming, and yet everybody knows that it is true.

You know the farmer is the last man in the world to avail himself of governmental agencies. He is an individualist to his finger tips. He has been accustomed all his life to carry on his activities without the cooperation of either men or governments. He sows, he cultivates, and he reaps as an individual. He is always subject to weather conditions, over which he has no control. He knows that. He has always been willing to pit his labor, his time, and his skill against conditions over which he has no control. All that has made him a man of courage. It has made him a man of individuality. It has made him a man who is willing to go out and take his equal chances with any other man, and this is all we undertake to give him in this bill.

I do not know, and I am repeating it over and over again; I am not holding out to the farmer the idea that this bill is going to do a great deal for him; but I do think it comes with poor grace—and I say it with all courtesy—from men who supported the legislation to make an absolute present to the railroads of this country of hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars in order that they might tide over the industrial depression to say that this is class legislation. It comes with poor grace from men who supported the merchant marine, because ultimately and in its last analysis its principal service is to be to the exporters of this country and not to the people at large, men who have supported that and have voted away hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars—yea, billions of dollars—to build up a merchant marine so that we may carry our commerce abroad now to say that this is class legislation and that their consciences will not permit them to support class legislation.

It comes with peculiarly bad grace—and I say that with all due courtesy—from men who voted for the so-called emergency tariff bill in order to give them a tariff on peanuts in Georgia to say now that the wheat grower in the West is not entitled to any kind of consideration, because the bill does not confer any special benefits upon the people of their own section.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Arkansas remembers that I did not vote for that bill.

Mr. CARAWAY. Did not the Senator vote for the emergency tariff bill?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. He did not.

Mr. CARAWAY. Did not the Senator at one time announce that he was going to do so?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. He did not.

Mr. CARAWAY. I retract all that, then.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I come from the second cotton-producing State in the Union, and I never will vote for any kind of protective tariff.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, well, everybody knew that there was no protection to cotton, but there was some protection to peanuts; and nearly everyone from Georgia in both Houses voted for that emergency tariff because it protected against the cheap oils of the Orient the great industry of peanut growing in Georgia.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. There is one instance where the Senator is mistaken. I did not.

Mr. CARAWAY. And it will come with equally bad grace from Senators who are going to vote for protection upon lead in Missouri or copper in Arizona or cotton goods in Massachusetts, that yields a direct benefit to the people they represent, to say now, "We are not permitted under our oaths and under our consciences to vote for this because it is class legislation."

Oh, just let us be absolutely fair with ourselves. All legislation is more or less class legislation. Why, there are Sena-

tors here urging with a great deal of earnestness—and I am joining with them—the passage of a more stringent prohibition bill. It is not going to do the people any good who are not afflicted with the habit of drinking or who have no friends who are. It is for certain folks. All legislation is class legislation; but I want to say, and I repeat, many of the Senators who are opposing the creation of this so-called farm export corporation are going to vote, and have voted, many, many millions of dollars for road improvement, and I rather imagine the Senator from New Jersey did that.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARAWAY. Certainly.

Mr. EDGE. The Senator's object undoubtedly is—and I have no criticism whatever of it—to help the farmers. I am inclined to believe that they need and deserve help; but is not the Senator willing to consider the use of the present machinery of the Government, with perhaps additional powers, rather than setting up this entirely new governmental agency with the buying and selling privilege?

Mr. CARAWAY. Absolutely. I am not wedded to that provision of this bill. I want to say to the Senator from New Jersey and Senators from other sections of this country that if they imagine that the farmer is no worse off than the industrial East, they know absolutely nothing of his condition. I am willing to venture the assertion, and if I were inclined to wager I would be willing to bet every dollar that I have or ever expect to own, that 99 per cent of the cotton growers of this country will be bankrupt this year. I do not say that they will all go into bankruptcy court, because ordinarily farmers do not go there; but there will not be 1 per cent of the farmers in the cotton-growing States that could pay their debts. In my own section of the country—and it is one of the very richest in these United States, the great delta lying along the Mississippi River, known as the St. Francis Delta—I know by looking at the advertised sales that 50 per cent of the lands in that country are going to be sold for taxes this year, with the hope of being able to redeem them when the present crop is matured and gathered. I know that there is not a man in my home county who, if he were to take every asset he has to any bank in my country, could borrow \$10,000 to save his immortal soul, because it is not there. It is a case of absolute prostration; and if you of the industrial East imagine that you can destroy the best market that you ever had, because we buy everything that we wear from your factories, we buy all the meat that we eat from the packing houses in your section of the country, we buy every piece of farm machinery from factories located north and east of us—if you think it is a good policy in order to say, "We will not contaminate our records by voting for class legislation," to destroy the buying power of 20,000,000 of people, why, God bless your souls, you can take the position of the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Georgia, and say, "We will not support this because it is class legislation"; and you will find that more people than the agriculturists are depending for their prosperity upon the prosperity of the farmer, and that class is a great deal broader than just those people who earn their bread in the sweat of their brows.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether he does not think this bill impresses upon us the importance of Congress passing a just future contracts law or amending the present law?

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course, I have always been committed to the theory that you should not gamble in the products of the farm at all. I have voted for it every time I got a chance, and I am going to vote for it again before this extraordinary session adjourns, because I am sure we are going to get a chance to vote on it. All I want to see the farmer get is a fair deal. I want to see him have the same agency to market his products that the manufacturer has, and nothing else. I do not care whether you call it the War Finance Corporation or what you call it. I do not think there is any pride of authorship in the measure. I am sure the Senator from Nebraska would be perfectly willing to accept any amendment if it did not strike at the very life and vitals of the act. I helped to report out the bill. I have no pride about it at all. I would vote for it, as Shakespeare said about a rose, under any other name, I do not care what you call it. I should like to see it passed. Some folks imagine that every time you try to help the farmer you are passing class legislation, and every time you help a railroad or pass a tariff bill to build up the wealth of the manufacturing and exporting part of this country, you are doing a patriotic act. I want to help this farm class as well as the others.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator has such clear and, I think, sensible views upon this subject that I wanted to ask him if he would give the Senate the benefit of his judgment upon another feature of the bill, the provision placing it in the power of a corporation to buy up the products of the country and to sell those products. I could give the Senator a little illustration. The bill is certainly beneficial, I believe, but if the Government would put a hundred million dollars in my hands to-day I could take care of the surplus crops of any commodity, could corner the market, and could double the price of that product within 30 days by simply taking care of that surplus and in effect holding the market. The bill contains provisions which, while they may not be abused, give authority to this corporation to buy and sell these farm products, and I would really like to hear the Senator's view upon that.

Mr. CARAWAY. I thoroughly agree with the Senator's intimation that it could be abused. I realize that the Secretary of Agriculture, in whom I have the very highest confidence, and the two men to be appointed as directors to help him direct this corporation—and, by the way, they will be appointed by the President of the party to which the Senator from North Dakota belongs—could abuse this privilege. They could buy altogether wheat and help the wheat farmer; they could buy stock and help the stock grower; or they could buy cotton and help the cotton farmer; they could buy rice and lift out of bankruptcy the rice growers of this country. But that same possibility lies in the War Finance Corporation, for which, I am sure, the Senator voted. The War Finance Corporation does not have to loan to any particular person. It can loan to whomsoever it sees fit. It could loan to the exporters of shoes exclusively, or the exporters of dry goods, the exporters of wheat, or of any other product. It has it within its power to do that. The Federal Reserve Board has the same authority. Every governmental agency that we set up has to be trusted. It could destroy one section. The President of these United States is asking now to be given power in the tariff bill to make preferential rates on certain commodities, and I have an idea that the Senators of the Republican Party are going to vote for such a provision, and I am sure it will be incorporated in this present bill. Yet we all know that the President could use that power to destroy, if he wanted to, or he could use that power to enrich certain sections of the country. I do not think he will do it. I realize that the power is within this bill.

Now, let me discuss just one other feature and I will be through.

Mr. EDGE. May I ask another question along that line before the Senator leaves it?

Mr. CARAWAY. Certainly.

Mr. EDGE. Does not the Senator see an advantage in the Government loaning money to move crops, loaning money through a governmental agency, like the War Finance Corporation, as compared to the Government actually buying the crops and being responsible for their distribution?

Mr. CARAWAY. I agree with the Senator. I dislike to see the Government go into the purchasing and selling of any product. But I do not want to discard a principle simply because I can not control the agency through which that principle may be used to benefit the country. I do not like the idea of the Government buying and selling at all. I do not think any more of it than does the Senator from New Jersey. I do not like the idea of the Government building ships. I did not like the idea of the Government operating railroads. I do not like to see the Government going into any kind of private business. It has always been more or less an experiment, and a costly experiment. But we have to do one of two things. We have to extend the aid this way or decline, and, as some one said here to-day, it will not do any good to the farmers of this country to say that we will create for them an agency and that we will find them buyers in Europe for their products, but will not finance their deals, because the farmer can not keep his products and carry out these long-term deals.

I heard the representative of the Polish Government testify. He said they would like to have cotton. I use that merely as an illustration. He said wheat and other farm products as well. But he said, "We have absolutely no prospect of paying under two or three and possibly four years."

Unless the Government is going to come in and by some process buy this product from the farmer who has to have the money he will not be able to take advantage of that market, because in most cases in my section of the country, and I think in most of the farming sections, a farmer can not ship his products now unless he can get a release from some one who has a mortgage on them.

There is hardly a farm product in New York that is not covered by a mortgage and there is hardly a State in this Union—



and I doubt if there is one—that does not make it a crime to ship out of the State property on which a mortgage rests. There is not a State, I presume, in the Union which does not give the mortgagee the right to take the property if the mortgagor undertakes to remove it. Therefore, unless you are willing to pay the farmer for his product you are going to benefit the speculator the Senator from Georgia talked about, instead of benefiting the man who actually grew the farm products.

I have been told that the bill has been slated for defeat. I shall not be surprised if that happens, but I do not believe any Senator will be able to get away with the argument that the farmer can always rely upon the party to tell him what is good and what is bad for him. I do not believe the farmer is going to come back to that doctor for his second prescription when he votes to destroy the only hope the farmer has to get something for his farm products, and not to have to deliver them all to the men who have mortgages on them.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a bulletin issued by the Census Bureau, dealing with farm mortgages in the various States. It tells more eloquently than I the story of the struggle and failure of our farmers—the struggle this measure is designed to help.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"29.8 PER CENT OF FARMS MORTGAGED—AVERAGE DEBT IN 1920 SHOWN IN BUREAU OF CENSUS REPORT TO BE \$1,306.

"Mortgages on Arkansas farms increased from \$8,941,332 to \$38,539,428 between 1910 and 1920, a gain of 331 per cent, according to a recent bulletin from the Bureau of the Census, which shows also that the 1920 mortgages represent 29.8 per cent of the total value of the farms in the State. The average debt per farm is shown to be \$1,306 and the average value per farm \$4,384. The number of farms mortgaged is 29,504.

"FIGURES FOR UNITED STATES.

"For the United States the report says:

"The number of farms operated by their owners for which the amount of mortgage debt was reported in 1920, according to the Fourteenth Census, was 1,193,787, as compared with 1,006,511 in 1910. The amount of debt reported was \$4,012,711,213 in 1920, as against \$1,726,172,851 in 1910. The increase in the amount of debt amounted to \$2,286,538,362, or 132.5 per cent, while the value of the mortgaged farms increased 117.6 per cent during the decade and their number 18.6 per cent.

"No attempt was made by the Census Bureau to secure information with regard to mortgage debt on farms operated by managers or tenants; and the amount of the mortgage debt was tabulated only for those farms which consisted wholly of land owned by the operator, excluding farms whose operators hired additional land.

"The States reporting the largest amount of farm mortgage debt in 1920 were as follows: Iowa, \$489,816,739; Wisconsin, \$354,574,391; Minnesota, \$254,475,222; California, \$224,063,903; Missouri, \$216,463,880; and Illinois, \$197,504,756.

"The greatest relative increase in farm mortgage debt took place in the Mountain States, Montana showing a debt more than seven times as large in 1920 as in 1910. Notable relative increases were made also in Florida, Tennessee, Arkansas, and California. The largest absolute increase was in Iowa—from \$204,242,722 in 1910 to \$489,816,739 in 1920, an increase of \$285,574,017, which is more than the total farm-mortgage debt of any other State except Wisconsin.

"RATIO OF DEBT TO VALUE.

"The value of the farms for which the amount of the mortgage debt was reported in 1920 was \$13,722,729,610. The debt, amounting to \$4,012,711,213, therefore represented 29.1 per cent of the value. The mortgage debt reported for 1910 represented 27.3 per cent of the value of the mortgaged farms.

"INTEREST RATE.

"The average rate of interest paid on farm mortgages in the United States in 1920 was 6.1 per cent. Among the several States the rate varied from 5.1 per cent in New Hampshire to 7.8 per cent in Arkansas. In six States the rate was less than 5½ per cent; in 21 States it was 5½ per cent or more but less than 6½ per cent; and in 21 States, for the most part in the West and South, it was 6½ per cent or more.

"AVERAGE DEBT PER FARM.

"The average amount of mortgage debt per farm for the United States in 1920 was \$3,361, as compared with \$1,715 in 1910.

"The average debt per farm in Iowa in 1920 was \$9,358; in Nevada, \$8,499; in Nebraska, \$7,042; in South Dakota, \$6,412; in California, \$6,001; in Arizona, \$5,441; and in Illinois, \$5,385."

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	McCormick	Sheppard
Brandagee	Glass	McCumber	Shortridge
Broussard	Harris	McKellar	Simmons
Bursum	Harrison	McKinley	Smoot
Calder	Heflin	McNary	Sutherland
Capper	Johnson	Moses	Underwood
Caraway	Kellogg	Nelson	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Kenyon	New	Warren
Dial	Keyes	Norris	Watson, Ga.
Edge	King	Overman	Willis
Elkins	Ladd	Pittman	
Ernst	Lenroot	Pomerene	
Fernald	Lodge	Reed	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a statement from the Chief of the Bureau of Markets, Department of Agriculture, dated July 6, 1921, with reference to the prices of farm products. I inquired as to those prices, having in mind the emergency tariff act approved May 28, 1921, and I wanted to know whether any effect had resulted. The statement shows that wheat declined from \$1.72 on May 28 to \$1.39 on June 25. All the products apparently have not been benefited by the emergency tariff act, which it was claimed would benefit the farmers. I think we shall have to devise some other plan to help agriculture. I ask that the statement may be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Week ending—				
	May 28.	June 4.	June 11.	June 18.	June 25.
Wheat—No. 2 red winter, Chicago, per bushel.....	\$1.72	\$1.70	\$1.51	\$1.46	\$1.39
Wheat—No. 1 northern spring, Minneapolis.....per bushel.....	1.71	1.60	.....	1.74	1.64
Corn—No. 3 yellow, Chicago.....do.....	.62	.65	.63	.62	.62
Oats—No. 3, white, Chicago.....do.....	.40	.41	.37	.37	.37
Rye—No. 2, Chicago.....do.....	1.58	1.57	1.41	1.32	1.23
Barley—No. 2, Minneapolis.....do.....	.61	.62	.61	.59	.58
Hay—No. 1 timothy, Chicago, per long ton.....	23.00	23.00	23.00	22.00	22.00
Hogs, average price, Chicago, per 100 pounds.....	8.14	7.85	8.04	7.97	8.43
Cattle, heavy beef, Chicago, per 100 pounds.....	8.13	8.30	8.08	8.00	7.93
Sheep, fat, Chicago.....per 100 pounds.....	4.75	4.38	4.63	4.07	4.85
Lambs, fat, Chicago.....do.....	10.13	10.50	11.00	10.75	11.83
Lard, pure, tierces, Chicago, per 100 pounds.....	11.75	11.63	11.63	12.13	12.25
Hides, packer, heavy native steer, Chicago.....per pound.....	.13	.135	.135	.135	.135
Cotton—Middling spot, New Orleans, per pound.....	.117	.118	.114	.111	.104
Wool, three-eighths blood, fleece, Boston.....per pound.....	.280	.280	.275	.275	.275
Butter, 92 score, New York.....do.....	.288	.293	.319	.328	.341
Eggs, fresh firsts, New York, per dozen.....	.245	.262	.263	.262	.266
Peanuts, Virginia Jumbo, New York, per pound.....	.121	.123	.123	.125	.124

#### PROTECTION OF MATERNITY AND INFANCY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1039) for the public protection of maternity and infancy, and providing a method of cooperation between the Government of the United States and the several States.

Mr. REED resumed the speech begun by him Wednesday, June 29. After having spoken for more than an hour, he said:

Mr. President, I am entirely willing to stop at this time, but I have not concluded my remarks. I expect to resume to-morrow, with the courtesy and kindness of the Senate.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator expect to talk up to the time of voting to-morrow?

Mr. REED. I do not expect to deprive the Senator from Iowa of a chance to reply.

Mr. KENYON. I do not care about that, but I was wondering whether the Senator would finish before that time.

Mr. REED. I do not know how much time I shall want. I shall not take up nearly as much time as has been taken up in the printing of this pile of literature.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, July 22, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate July 21 (legislative day of July 20), 1921.*

## TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

## ASSISTANT SOLICITOR.

Thomas Lack, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Solicitor of the Treasury. (An additional position created by the act approved Mar. 3, 1921.)

## COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Judson LaMoure, jr., of Pembina, N. Dak., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 34, with headquarters at Pembina, N. Dak., in place of Alexander Morrison.

Charles C. Hinkle, of Savannah, Tenn., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 43, with headquarters at Memphis, Tenn., in place of George P. Woollen.

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

## UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Peyton Gordon, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney, District of Columbia, vice John E. Laskey, resigned.

## JUDGE OF MUNICIPAL COURT.

Mary O'Toole, of the District of Columbia, to be a judge of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, vice Michael M. Doyle, resigned.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 21 (legislative day of July 20), 1921.*

## POSTMASTERS.

## MINNESOTA.

David L. Williams, Rochester.

## TEXAS.

Robert L. Ginn, Brownsville.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, July 21, 1921.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou merciful One, who dwellest in the white light that no man can stand, let us feel that there is no barrier between us. May we know that God is with us, and we ask a blessing of divine approval. Be Thou the guest of each and the teacher of all. Among the worthy purposes that fill our breasts may the ambition to bear a good name be first—a name that can be spoken without a blush or apology above a whisper under all the circumstances and conditions of life. And oh, the joy at the last when we hand it back to God without reproach. Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the action of the majority of the Committee on Committees, I present the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

## House resolution 158.

*Resolved*, That MARTIN B. MADDEN, Member of Congress from Illinois, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

## THE TARIFF.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the House resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the tariff bill. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] will please take the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7456, the tariff bill, with Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7456, the tariff bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7456) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALMON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama rise?

Mr. ALMON. To ask unanimous consent to address the committee for one minute out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to address the committee for one minute out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, the people are staggering under the burdens of taxation. We should be engaged to-day in a revision of revenue laws, reducing certain taxes and repealing certain vexatious and annoying taxes which were provided for during the war. The people would be interested in that, but they are not interested in this tariff legislation but will be when it goes into effect and they begin to suffer from its operation. Instead of that the Republican Party, which is now in entire control of the executive and legislative branches of the Government, have before the Congress a tariff bill providing for the highest custom duties on imports of any tariff law that has ever heretofore been enacted. The Republicans, years ago, contended that tariff duties were necessary to protect our infant American industries, but now, since we have gotten to be the greatest and richest Nation in the world, they contend that labor and capital interested in manufacture should be protected by high import duties. It has been demonstrated time and again that the manufacturers who have had the greatest protection under former tariff laws, paid their employees the smallest amount of wages, so the contention that a protective tariff benefits labor is fallacious. Carpenters and blacksmiths get better wages than the employee in the woolen and steel mills. The carpenter and brick mason are not protected by a tariff. If American manufacturers can not compete with foreign manufacturers now, when will they ever be able to do so? If they can not now it is not because they are in their infancy.

The effect of this bill, as of former high protective Republican tariff laws, will make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

The Democratic Party has always stood for a tariff for revenue only.

The farmers are suffering worse than any other class of people by reason of the sudden falling off in the price of farm products. Farming will only be profitable when we have a market for the surplus products of the farm. We must export at least 40 per cent of the cotton grown in the South. The chief reason for the low price of cotton now is a want of foreign markets, and this is caused by the inability of the foreign countries heretofore using our cotton to buy it. The only way that they can buy our products and repay the \$10,000,000,000 loan we made to them during the war is to pay for them in gold, which they have not, or export to this country their surplus products. With this condition along comes this bill, backed up by the administration, proposing to put the rates on imports so high as to build a wall around the United States and keep out imports from other countries, in that way destroying our export trade. It will also destroy our splendid \$3,000,000,000 merchant marine that was built up during the World War. Ships could not go over loaded with our exports and return empty; it would amount to bankruptcy in the shipping business. Ships must have a cargo both ways to be successful. The rates in this bill are not only protective but in many cases will be prohibitive. No one can tell what the rates will be for the reason that they are to be based upon American valuation. Under former tariff laws when our merchants bought goods abroad the duty imposed was controlled by the amount paid for the goods in the foreign market. Under the terms of this bill he would have to pay rates according to the American valuation of such goods, and he could not know what this would be at the time that purchase was made abroad. The effect of this is to



make the rates that much higher and destroy import business, and as I have explained, foreign countries can not buy from us if they can not sell to us.

The American farmers have not been benefited one iota by the Republican emergency tariff law passed at the beginning of this session of Congress. For illustration, under its operation the price of wheat has dropped from \$2.20 to \$1.10 per bushel. How long will the American people be fooled in this way?

The friends of this bill admit that it will raise \$600,000,000 in revenue annually, and when passed on to the people will amount to five times that amount. It will encourage profiteering and increase the cost of living at a time when the people are properly demanding and expecting Congress to reduce taxes, the cost of living, and prevent profiteering as far as possible. Some one has said that high protective tariff did not increase prices. We all know better. If it did not, they would not be here demanding it and contributing millions of dollars to the Republican campaign committees.

Congress has appropriated more than \$200,000,000 since 1916 to the States and counties to aid in the construction of roads. One of the principal road materials in many parts of the country is asphalt, 92 per cent of which is manufactured in this country and 8 per cent imported. This bill provides a tax of 15 per cent on all asphalt hereafter imported, the effect of which will be to increase the price of this essential material and create a great asphalt monopoly in America.

The building of roads and streets should be encouraged. It is unnecessary to enumerate the many advantages of good roads. A tax on asphalt, if allowed to remain in this bill, will greatly increase the cost of all streets and roads.

Potash, nitrogen, and phosphate are the essential ingredients of fertilizer. The price of fertilizer has been almost prohibitive. The price now is unreasonable in proportion to the price of farm products, due largely to the cost of nitrogen being dependent upon sodium nitrate from Chile. The farmer pays the Chilean Government \$11.18 export duty on every ton of sodium nitrate he buys and also very high ocean freight rates, being four or five thousand miles from Chile to the American ports. The American farmer will get no relief in this respect until nitrogen is produced at the great Government nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals, Ala., which I hope will be done in the near future. We have a good supply of phosphate in this country. Prior to the war we secured all of our potash from Germany. The normal amount used was about 250,000 tons.

During the war and while we could not import potash from Germany an effort has been made by the Government and private capital to manufacture potash in the United States. I had hoped that it would be successful, but the result has been disappointing. In 1920 about 47,000 tons of potash was manufactured in the United States, but it is not satisfactory to the American farmer, and he will not use fertilizer containing American potash when he knows it or can do better. There has never been any effort heretofore to place a tariff on potash, but now at a time when the American farmer is suffering as he never did before and when the Republican Party pretends to be his friend places in this bill a tariff on potash, the effect of which will be to add from \$2 to \$4 per ton on the price of fertilizer, which he is forced to buy and use, this will not only apply to the farmers in the South but every State in the Union. The increased demand and use of fertilizer in practically every State has been unusual.

I wish we could produce potash in this country in quantity and quality so as to become a real competitor of Germany and France, but nature has made it impossible. This tariff on potash will not affect the manufacturers of potash in Germany and France, but will be added to the price of the fertilizer the farmer is forced to buy—you will hear from the farmers later. [Applause.]

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. HADLEY: Page 190, line 9; strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, That when any country, dependency, or other subdivision of government imposes a duty on calcium acetate imported from the United States an equal duty shall be imposed upon such article coming into the United States from such country."

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Chairman, this proviso is added to the item as it stands on the free list.

The situation is this: Calcium acetate, or as it is often referred to, acetate of lime, is on the free list under the present law. Prior to the present law it was carried in the basket clause. Various other products of the wood-chemical industry have been given a rate of duty under this bill. This particular

item was not made dutiable, and upon further consideration the committee has looked into the matter and is of the opinion that it should be carried on the free list with this countervailing arrangement.

There is a largely increased production of acetate of lime, or calcium acetate, in Canada, and Canada maintains a duty of 17½ per cent. Their importations are very material, and they increased production in Canada from 1915 to 1918 about 50 per cent. This is an important item in the production of chemical products from hardwood, an industry in this country which ought to be protected under the theory of this bill. We simply place it in the free list with the countervailing arrangement.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HADLEY. Yes; I will.

Mr. GARNER. If I understand it, this bill has three or four peculiar features to it that were never in a bill, as I recall, heretofore enacted, unless it was the Canadian reciprocity act. It first has the proposition of placing in the hands of the Tariff Commission the dyestuff industry, with authority to place an embargo upon certain dyes coming into this country; and then, if I understand it, it authorizes the President, in the lumber schedule, with respect to its operation on the imports of other countries, to regulate the rates to apply to them. It also authorizes the President, under title 3 in sections 301, 302, and 303, to raise and lower the duties on any article in this bill and take it from the free list and put it on the dutiable list, or take it from the dutiable list and put it on the free list. Now, you propose in this provision to create a new procedure, whereby you give to the President no discretion whatever to trade in the premises, but you automatically apply any rate that any foreign country may levy against this article going from America to foreign shores. You automatically levy that rate as against all countries. Is that correct?

Mr. HADLEY. The gentleman has referred to several constructive features of this bill. I am discussing simply this one, and I prefer to confine the debate to this item. It is a very important one. We have a wood-product chemical industry, and in the manufacture of hardwoods in this country it develops that a great many of the limbs and inferior parts of a tree are not susceptible of use in the form of lumber, but they are eminently valuable for distillation purposes, by which we produce a number of wood chemicals, such as wood alcohol, charcoal, acetate of lime or calcium acetate, and others. There are nearly 100 plants in the United States engaged in this business.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HADLEY. I would like to make one additional statement. This wood-chemical industry, as I say, has about 100 plants engaged in the business in this country. There are, I think, some eighty-odd firms. This is their finished product, although it is the raw material which enters into the production of acetone and acetic acid, important chemical products. It is an industry which is meeting with foreign competition. Now, it is proposed simply to provide that when a rate is maintained against the American commodity on entering a foreign country, we shall apply the corresponding rate against that commodity when it enters our ports of entry from such foreign country.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman has not explained the situation yet. I did not catch the exact reading of the amendment. Suppose France, for instance, should levy a rate against this calcium acetate that came from the United States but England did not levy any rate against it. What would be the attitude of this Government in reference to English importations of that article under the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. HADLEY. Under this amendment competitive articles coming into this country from a country which maintains a rate of duty against us on such articles would be charged a corresponding rate of duty on coming into this country.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Who is to ascertain the fact that this duty is to be levied?

Mr. HADLEY. This is the usual countervailing duty. It is not an unusual arrangement.

Mr. WALSH. It will be determined by the administrative officers?

Mr. HADLEY. It is a part of the administration under the act. It is a very common procedure. It is not new. It has been carried in various bills before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Washington be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. It does not involve the exercise of the authority conferred upon the President with a view to getting reciprocal treaties, or anything of that kind? It is nothing new?

Mr. HADLEY. It is an absolute arrangement that Congress determines here now, but leaves it to the administration to carry it into effect.

Mr. WALSH. It is nothing new?

Mr. HADLEY. Nothing new at all.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] tried to make it appear that this was another new idea.

Mr. HADLEY. All Members of the House, I take it, are familiar with the countervailing rates which have obtained under previous bills. That is what this is.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LONDON. I think the gentleman has not answered the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER].

Mr. HADLEY. I answered it by a general statement, and anyone who heard the statement knows that the question asked by the gentleman from Texas was answered in my general statement as to the effect of the amendment. I did not answer specifically with reference to the various countries having various arrangements.

Mr. LONDON. I understand, but you have left it to the President to change the rate or to put things on the free list or to take them off the free list?

Mr. HADLEY. Oh, no. The gentleman is in error.

Mr. LONDON. Why make an exception in favor of this particular article?

Mr. HADLEY. Every article in this bill should be measured by the competitive conditions surrounding it, and under the competitive conditions surrounding this item it is the judgment of the committee that this countervailing arrangement should be made.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman from New York is in error when he says the President is given the right to put the article on the free list. The President is only given the right to reduce the rates 20 per cent. He has no right to put an article on the free list.

Mr. LONDON. He has no right to put it on the free list?

Mr. LONGWORTH. No.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HADLEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time of the gentleman be extended one minute so that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Delaware in his own right in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, in the matter of the countervailing duties under this bill, is it optional with the President, or is it obligatory under the act, that he shall enforce them?

Mr. HADLEY. Under the countervailing arrangement as to this item, it is obligatory that it be enforced as a countervailing arrangement. There would be no duty on the commodity unless it comes from a country where there is a rate fixed upon it.

Mr. LAYTON. Take, for instance, India. India places a rate of 15 per cent upon goatskins and she remits 10 units of that to her colonies and Great Britain. In the countervailing duties applicable to that particular subject, would the President have an option, or would it be obligatory upon him to enforce it?

Mr. HADLEY. I am making a statement now about acetate of lime, and not in respect to goatskins. I ask for a vote.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended or else that I be recognized in my right. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this countervailing duty is a new instrumentality and was first placed in the tariff laws, as I understand it, in order to fix an import duty upon oil. When we were practically the sole oil producing and exporting country, there was injected into our former tariff bills what was called a countervailing duty, which provided that

where a foreign country imposed a duty on any commodity imported from the United States the same duty was automatically laid on that commodity when imported from that country into the United States, and the Members of Congress who passed that law did not know that it put a duty on the import of oil; but with that provision in our law, all that the oil producer here had to do to get a duty on oil from Mexico was to get Mexico to put a duty on oil from the United States, and the same thing applied in the case of countries that produced oil outside of the United States. Whatever duty any country put on our oil automatically our law put that duty on oil from that country. Now, we have got this countervailing duty system injected firmly into our tariff laws, and no man knows what the duty may or will be on the article that is given the benefit of the countervailing duty. For instance, Canada puts a duty upon lumber because she thinks, or her lumber manufacturers pretend to think, that we can make it cheaper than she does, and, therefore, she wants protection against us; this bill automatically places that same duty on Canadian lumber, while pretending to put it on the free list. Everybody here knows that lumber ought to be on the free list, and the fact that some other country has put a duty upon it does not affect the reason why it should be upon the free list, and we ought to be indifferent as to whether other countries put a duty on lumber. We ought to conserve our timber supply. But on any commodity our country can compete with foreign countries or it can not. If it can compete, then the levying of a duty by a foreign country does not diminish our ability to compete, and we ought not ever to levy a countervailing duty on the sole ground that some other country has levied a duty against our product. The countervailing duty is levied upon the theory that we can compete without a duty, but through spite or for some other reason we levy it against any country which levies a duty upon our products.

If we can manufacture a material without a duty, how is that ability to so manufacture it affected by the fact that some other country levies a duty against us? We are fast driving to the position that all nations will endeavor to so restrict international trade that international trade will vanish and every nation will become an isolated unit, trading with itself, and international commerce must perish and the welfare of the people at large be subjected to combinations within each separate nation, to the detriment of the whole and the benefit of the very few.

Some of us were led to the belief that an opportunity would be given this House to vote for actual free lumber, but we see now that the rule under which we are proceeding is shrewdly devised so that no such opportunity will be given, and our lumber kings are given a high duty on all Canadian lumber, notwithstanding the universal knowledge of the combinations by which the price of lumber in the United States has been raised something like 400 per cent in the last 20 years.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Page 171, line 11, strike out the numerals "42" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "45."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to the lace schedule. Laces are a luxury. The duty which was put on laces originally was in proportion to the needs of the industry, about the lowest in the bill, although it is a very high duty. A number of lace industries started up during the war, and probably some of them will have to go out of business in any event, because we can not put on a high enough duty to enable them to continue. There is so much handwork upon laces that many kinds of them can be bought for one-third of the cost of production in this country. By reason of the duty being placed on long-staple cotton yesterday this duty of 42 per cent in the bill ought to be raised, I think, about 3 per cent to make up for that. All of the yarns that are used in the lace industry are made of long-staple cotton, and this duty was very low before in proportion to the needs of the industry. I think a good many of the lace manufacturers will have to go out of business even as it stands.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. In the event that on the vote in the House the duty shall be taken off long-staple cotton, and it shall go back to the free list, will the committee then give us a separate vote upon this amendment?



Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I could not say positively. As far as I am concerned, I think the lace manufacturers need the duty in any event.

Mr. FORDNEY. We will cross that river when we get to it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am not as a rule in favor of high duties, and, of course, there is a limit beyond which we should not go; but laces are a luxury that will be imported in practically the same quantity, notwithstanding the high duty. If this duty is increased 3 per cent it will give the manufacturers a better chance and the Government will get more revenue.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. COLLIER. I have no particular objection to the raising of this duty, but I want to again direct the attention of the committee to the fact that every few minutes another committee amendment comes in increasing the duties in the bill as originally reported. I want to reassert the statement that when we vote on this bill this afternoon you are going to find the rates very materially higher than in the bill as originally presented, and as we charged in our speeches in general debate.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. KING. I was very much surprised to hear the gentleman from Iowa state that a protective tariff would not be put on sufficiently high to protect the lace industry in this country. I want to ask the gentleman whether there was any evidence before the committee of American capital being invested in such industries in France or Italy which exported laces into the American market?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We had no such evidence before the committee. We did have evidence that laces could be brought in for about one-third of the cost of making them in this country.

Mr. KING. It will protect, as a matter of fact, American capital invested in France and Italy. I mean, the rates in the present bill.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. These figures that are recommended by the committee are supposed to be the compensatory duty owing to putting cotton of 1½ inches in length on the dutiable list.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would not base it entirely on that, although that is one reason. The lace industry was held down closer in respect to duties than almost any other industry, and some contend that they can not continue under the rate provided in the bill.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the gentleman from Iowa that this rate of duty will put such industries out of business. Forty-five per cent on American valuation is equivalent to 82½ per cent on the foreign valuation, and I believe they will be fully protected with 45 per cent on the American valuation.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, what is pending before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Iowa increasing the rate of duty on laces.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I want to call to the attention of Members on our Democratic side of the House who voted for a tariff on cotton that the very thing is happening that we knew would happen, to wit, in order to make it sure that the tax was passed on to the consumer the Committee on Ways and Means would bring in some compensatory duties to further protect the manufacturer. Now, nothing in the world illustrates better the fallacy of the Republican doctrine or argument that the foreigner pays the tax than these compensatory duties.

What is the situation? They place an ad valorem duty of 15 per cent on cotton of more than 1½ inches in staple. That means that there will be collected from the manufacturer which imports it a duty to that amount. If the foreigner paid the tax, as our Republican friends have always contended, then when Uncle Sam attempted to reimburse the manufacturer by means of compensatory duties, the manufacturer, if he was honest, would say, "Oh, no, Uncle Sam, you don't owe me anything; you don't need to increase the duties on my product, because the foreigner pays this tax; you do not owe me any reimbursement whatever." But that does not happen. On the contrary, the manufacturer says, "Uncle Sam, you have taxed me 15 per cent ad valorem on all the cotton imported of a staple of more than 1½ inches in length, and therefore I want you to give me an additional duty of 3 per cent upon my laces and embroidery, although I already have a duty of 42 per cent on my goods, in order that I may add the duty which I pay on raw cotton to my prices and pass it on down to the consumer and be sure that he

pays the tax." That would not be so bad if the manufacturer only passed that part of it which he pays on down to the consumer. But the manufacturer does not stop there; he buys a great deal of long-staple cotton in the United States. In fact, he buys most that he uses here in the United States, and therefore he will not only pass on down the increase of 3 per cent he is getting as compensatory duty on account of the foreign importation, but he will very likely pass 3 per cent more down in the way of profit to that which he pays for the American-produced cotton, and you can not prevent him from doing it, because you have given him an additional protection of 3 per cent, which will apply to his goods manufactured out of American cotton just as well as those made out of imported cotton. And do not think for a moment that he will fail to take advantage of this fruitful opportunity.

Nothing better illustrates the way these duties are passed on down to the consumer than a clause which I read some time ago in the sale contract of the American Sugar Refining Co. When we had up the emergency tariff law in the House some months ago the American Sugar Refining Co. and the Franklin Refining Co. sent out the following notice to the trade:

FEBRUARY 26, 1921.

Notice to the trade: Effective at once all refined sugar contracts of the American Refining Co. and the Franklin Sugar Refining Co. will carry an additional tariff clause reading as follows:

"The amount of any increase in duty per pound on Cuban raw sugar, 96 basis, shall be added to the price named herein, and shall apply from the effective date of such increase on any unshipped portion of this contract."

Now, if these two refining companies used only Cuban raws in making their refined sugars, it would be perfectly natural for them to add the duty to the finished product, because we have long since learned that the consumer pays the tax and not the foreigner. But they do not use Cuban raws alone. I am quite sure that at least one of these companies uses a large amount of Louisiana raws. But the duty is added to the contract price regardless of where the raws are produced. Does the Louisiana sugar grower get the benefit of the amount collected by the refiners on his raws? Maybe he does and maybe he does not. Sometimes he does and sometimes he does not. But always the consumer pays. I am therefore against the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a splendid opportunity to call the attention of the committee to the very inconsistent position in which we placed ourselves on yesterday. A day or two ago I voted with the majority of this committee in favor of a tariff on hides, believing when I did so that the producers of hides in the United States were entitled to protection against the cheap hides, especially from South America. On yesterday we voted leather upon the free list.

Now, see the position we placed ourselves in. To my mind we have absolutely destroyed the purpose we had in voting a tariff upon hides. This will be the result: Hides will be tanned on the outside and come in duty free into this country. The American farmer and producer of hides in this country will not get the protection we sought to give him for the reason that he is thrown in direct competition with the free leather coming in from the outside. And it has made this much worse, for they can produce hides outside cheaper, and they likewise can produce leather cheaper on the outside than on the inside.

For the reason they get their labor cheaper and will get the raw material cheaper, this will absolutely destroy the purpose of our placing a tariff upon hides. And that is not the worst of it. We are going to drive capital out of this country. We are going to drive the tanner out of this country, where he can not compete successfully with the manufacturer of leather who gets his hides cheaper, who gets his labor cheaper on the outside, and whose product is admitted duty free into this country. This character of inconsistent legislation has heretofore resulted in driving many an industry out of this country into Canada, drove many industries clear over into the Orient, for the reason that their goods would be admitted free, where the raw material would have a tariff upon it if manufactured in this country.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. FESS. The American producer of leather could better afford to buy duty free leather from a foreign country employing foreign labor than to buy leather here at home.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes, infinitely better; and not only does it encourage the manufacturer of leather on the outside but it induces American capital to go outside to be invested in the manufacture of leather, and in consequence destroys the market for American hides.

Mr. FESS. That is the point; no price here.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There will be no price for the hide here because of the fact there will be no necessity for the hide

here; there will be no tanning of leather because leather will be produced on the outside and admitted duty free. So I hope that before this bill finally passes, if you want to secure to the American farmer the protection that is desired on hides, this glaring inconsistency will be corrected by placing a just compensatory tariff upon leather.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. BARKLEY. To move to strike out the last word. I wish to address the House on this amendment.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had not recognized the gentleman. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] spoke a few moments ago about long-staple cotton. I desire to say that the people of the United States produce 60 per cent of all the short-staple cotton produced in the world. There is no duty provided on short-staple cotton. We consume in the United States 40 per cent of our total production of short-staple cotton. The House has decided to place a duty on long-staple cotton. What for? For the benefit of the producers of long-staple cotton in the United States. There is a vast difference between the value of long and short staple cotton in the markets of the world. Why? Because it is not controlled in the United States. It is because we are obliged to purchase abroad long-staple cotton; therefore we are controlled by foreigners, and by placing a duty upon long-staple cotton and encouraging greater production in the United States it is my belief that we will create competition at home and lower the price of long-staple cotton.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. PADGETT. If a duty is placed only on long-staple cotton, is it right or proper to place a duty on cotton goods manufactured out of short-staple cotton?

Mr. FORDNEY. There is no relation between the two, and no suggestion of that kind is being made.

Mr. PADGETT. But you have a compensatory duty—

Mr. FORDNEY. It applies to goods made from long-staple cotton, not short-staple cotton. If the gentleman will read the amendment he will find that all it provides for is a compensatory duty on goods produced from long-staple cotton.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Is it not a fact, though, that the Treasury Department has found it impossible to administer the present compensatory law for the reason that no man can look at an article and tell whether it was  $1\frac{1}{2}$  or  $1\frac{1}{4}$  inch staple?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; the gentleman is in error. It is difficult to determine the staple, but goods made from long-staple cotton contain only a small percentage of short-staple cotton when the goods are sold as long-staple cotton goods. This is my information.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The Chief of the Division of Customs of the Treasury, Mr. Ashworth, told me a few days ago it was impossible to find a man who could tell whether or not  $1\frac{1}{4}$ -inch staple was in laces being imported, and that is the reason I asked the question.

Mr. FORDNEY. My beloved friend, Ashworth is a Democrat, and you know how hard it is for a Democrat to administer a protective tariff law.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I did not know he was a Democrat. I am glad to know you had the good sense to keep one Democrat in office.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, well, he is in for a short time, but look out, look out. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, a number of gentlemen have been proceeding out of order for the last 10 or 15 minutes, and I am going to ask to proceed out of order for 10 minutes, with the permission of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes out of order. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to once more apologize to the committee for having to be somewhat personal in what I have to say during these 10 minutes. My Democratic colleagues will bear me out and I am sure as far as they know my Republican colleagues will bear me out that during my 18 years' service here I have never undertaken, directly or indirectly, to chastise a single

Democrat for what I thought was his want of fealty to his party. I do not believe that is the best method by which to conduct a party organization. I know with what glee we over here witness you gentlemen washing your party linen in the presence of this company. So I shall not do that to-day, and I hope the time will never come when I shall feel it my duty to refer to a single one of my colleagues—in company, at least, especially the kind of company we usually have here—in a manner not commendatory of his acts. [Applause.]

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I never fight under cover with an adversary, it makes no difference whether it is a political adversary or otherwise. I never strike a blow in the back, whether it be political or otherwise. And every man here knows I do not carry a dagger under the muffled cloak of friendship. I play the game squarely. I play it on top of the table. [Applause.]

Now, I have taken the floor this morning for one purpose, and one purpose only, and that is to again state my position on the tariff, and after I have made my statement no gentleman in this House will again misunderstand my position touching the tariff question; and not misunderstanding it, no honest man will misrepresent it and no intelligent man will misinterpret it.

Mr. Chairman, I tried to say the other day that I believed there were three points, and three only, three positions, and three only, that could be taken by any gentleman in the United States touching the tariff question. I challenge you to go to any 10 men you find in this room or out of it and ask any one of them the question, "What is your position on the tariff?" and get but one of three answers, namely, "I am a free trader," or "I am a revenue-tariff man," or "I am a protective-tariff man." Do you know of any other answer? I pause to see whether you know of any other answer touching the tariff question.

I am not a free trader; I am not a protectionist. Therefore I must be a revenue-tariff man. I admire the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. I believe this entire body admires his candor and his frankness with reference to the tariff. He is a protectionist above and beyond all protectionists. He believes the American market ought to be only for the American producer. I likewise admire the candor of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD], who will tell you frankly that he would not levy one copper of duty on any industry in the United States, because he is for free trade with all the nations of the earth.

I can understand his philosophy. I can understand the philosophy of the gentleman from Michigan. But when some Republican tells me that he is a protectionist and he wants to protect that which is in his district and put that which is in somebody else's district on the free list, I can not understand his philosophy. [Applause.] Or when a Democrat tells me that he is a revenue Democrat and then says, "I am going to levy 30 per cent on the clothes that you wear, but I am going to admit duty free the shoes you have on your feet; I am going to levy a revenue duty on what you wear on your head and your hands, but I am going to put on the free list what you wear on your feet." I can not understand his reasoning; and it ought not be misunderstood that when you go to the customhouse as a Democrat you do not go for protection; you go to get money to put into the Treasury. Why, suppose that a stranger should go to the customs collector in New York and say, "What is your occupation?" "Why, I am here to collect money." "What for?" "To put into the Treasury of the United States." And while he is talking to him he sees two men approach. One of them is an Englishman, bearing the English flag, and he says, "What have you?" "I have a bundle of goods here—shirts, overalls, and other clothing made out of cotton, and made in England, which I want to bring in." He says, "How much are they worth?" "They are worth \$100." "Sir, I am here to collect money for the Treasury, and you will be compelled to pay me \$30 in order to bring them in." While he is paying his bill an Egyptian walks up, also bearing the English flag. He asks him, "What have you got?" He says, "I have a bale of cotton that I brought from Egypt with me. I want it to come into the United States." He says, "What is it worth?" "One hundred dollars." "All right, walk in. We charge you nothing." Gentlemen, how can you explain the doctrine that two men walk to the customhouse, and you are collecting money for the Treasury only; you are not looking to protection; you are not looking to the regulation of business—and what man is there who says the Democratic platform authorized through the customhouse the regulation of business—and one man comes up with \$100 worth of goods that the manufacturer has to buy, and when they get into this country you do not charge him a nickel, whereas when a man comes with clothing that must be had by every man, woman, and child in America, especially if he is poor, you say, "I am going to charge you 30 per cent ad valorem?"



They tell me I must not vote for a duty on cotton, that it is un-Democratic. Where is your authority? [Applause.] You gentlemen who say to me that I must not vote for a duty on hides or cotton or oil, I ask you where is your authority? [Applause.] Show me the Democratic platform or the adoption of a resolution in the Democratic caucus, and I will abide by it. But you ought not to say that I am not a Democrat because, forsooth, I do not take your views with reference to what I ought to do, when neither the Democratic platform nor the Democratic caucus have ever spoken upon the question.

I go down to Mobile, to my friend JOHN McDUFFIE's home, and I see two ships come in there. One of them comes from the Orient and flies the English flag; the other comes from Mexico and flies the English flag. One of them is loaded with peanut oil, and it comes up to the port in Mobile. The man says, "What have you there?" "I have a shipload of peanut oil. I want to land it in the United States." "What for?" "In order that the people may use it for food; it is a wholesome food." He says, "Sir, that is all right. I am here to collect the revenue under the present law." I am speaking of the Underwood bill now, which carries a duty of 6 cents per gallon on peanut oil. "It is peanut oil you have, and you can come into the United States, but you must give me 6 cents on each gallon you have, for we need the money to put in our Treasury."

Beside that vessel is docked a ship that comes from Tampico, Mexico. The revenue officer says, "What have you got?" The answer is, "I have got petroleum oil." "All right. What is it for?" "It is to be sold to railroads and manufacturers."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. I am very much obliged, gentlemen.

The peanut oil under the Underwood bill pays 6 cents a gallon. Did you put it there for protection? Am I a Republican if I vote to-day for half a cent a gallon on petroleum if you put 6 cents on peanut oil? You put it there. It is in the Underwood bill—6 cents a gallon on peanut oil. My God, if I put on petroleum oil one-twelfth of what you put on peanut oil, does it constitute me a Republican? [Applause.] I do not want a controversy. I never did want a controversy. But I would rather have my Democratic colleagues know my exact position than have the greatest honor that could be conferred upon me on the face of the earth. I want to ask you Democrats one question. My position is tax one, tax all; free one, free all; protect one, protect all. I ask you, if you collect a revenue duty on woolen goods, why do not you collect it on wool? [Applause.] Why do you not do it? You can not say that when the Democrats are in power it gives them an excuse. You never heard of a Republican wanting an excuse to put rates higher. He does not need any, God knows. I ought not to be charged while casting a righteous vote that I am giving an excuse to do something that is indefensible.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. I would prefer to conclude first. I am doing this by the sufferance of the House, however, and I shall not decline to yield if the gentleman urgently desires me to yield.

By the way, if I may have just one minute to reply to the hide argument, you put a duty of 15 per cent on hides the other day. One hide makes you 10 pairs of shoes. A 30-pound hide is now selling for \$1.20 and a 15 per cent duty is 18 cents. It costs you 1.8 cents additional on each pair of shoes. What do shoes cost you? Undoubtedly these shoes that you are wearing here would cost at least \$3 a pair wholesale, \$36 a dozen. You pay from \$5 to \$10, I presume. I ask if you are going to compensate him? I hear Democrats using that word "compensate." I do not see it in the Democratic platform that you lay duties for compensatory purposes. I never saw it in a Democratic platform. But suppose you do. You levy 1 per cent on \$3 shoes and you give the manufacturers 3 cents on every pair where you charge him 1.8 cents on the hide. I ask you who are opposing here the additional duty because hides are put on the tax list? I ask you why you are afraid to put 1 per cent on shoes when you have got 40 per cent on hats in the Underwood bill? Why do you scare at 1 per cent on shoes when you yourselves placed 40 per cent on hats and 30 per cent on gloves made out of skins? [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I think I have made myself pretty well understood. I am opposed to a free list, but if I am driven between the theory of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] and the theory of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD], if

I am driven to choose between the two, with conditions as they exist in Europe and throughout the world, we being a creditor nation to the extent of \$15,000,000,000, I tell you frankly I must go to free trade rather than to your kind of protection.

There is no doubt about it, gentlemen; and mark this prediction, because probably it will be the last I shall make in the way of a prediction concerning this tariff. Mark my prediction: In the next decade, unless our foreign debt is remitted—and it will never be remitted by my vote [applause]—and if our exports are to continue, as we hope they will, by leaps and bounds, until we become the greatest trade nation on the earth, I tell you, sir, there is no more question in my mind than that night will follow day that you must turn toward international free trade. I do not believe it is wise to do it now. I believe the middle course is the proper course, and in following that middle course I want to be consistent, I want to be just, I want to be fair, and I do not want to have to apologize to one man because I put this on the free list and to another man because I put something else on the tax list; so I will take you all and as your goods come to the customhouse I will levy a rate of from 1 to 50 per cent. I would put the highest duty on luxuries; I would put the next highest on comforts; and I would put the lowest on absolute necessities; and I think that in this method I would have a scheme of customhouse taxation that would appeal to every honest man. And whenever you undertake to say that it is un-Democratic, I want you to be as frank as I have been. I want you to tell me where you stand on the question. [Prolonged applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto close now.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I want to discuss this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee desires to discuss the amendment.

Mr. FORDNEY. Then I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Make it 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. STEVENSON. I move to amend by making it 10 minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina moves to amend the motion of the gentleman from Michigan by making it 10 minutes. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to close debate in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I, of course, enter into no quarrel with the gentleman from Texas, nor do I suppose that anything I have said will be construed as a quarrel with the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. GARNER. It gives me real pleasure to reassure the gentleman by stating that he is quite correct.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss this amendment for just a minute. I should like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], if he is willing to give me the information and has it, how many of these so-called compensatory cotton amendments are to be offered?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. My understanding is that one more is to be offered; no more by me. I will say that I did not offer this amendment so much as a compensatory duty as because the peculiar situation of this lace industry prevented any additional burdens being put upon it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I understood the gentleman to say in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] some time ago that it was to some extent at least compensatory.

Mr. Chairman, the particular thing to which I want to call the attention of the committee is this: The duty which was voted by the House was simply upon long-staple cotton. Now, when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] was making his opening speech the other day he said this:

The emergency tariff bill carried a duty on long-staple cotton, and after a sufficient time to fully investigate, it is found by the committee that with a duty upon long-staple cotton it is practically impos-

sible to determine whether or not cotton goods when manufactured and entering our ports were made from long-staple or medium or short-staple cotton.

Sir, that is true. That is the information I have had from the Treasury Department all along. That is the information I had at the time the emergency tariff bill was being passed, which fixed a duty of 7 cents on long staple and then raised the duty 7 cents on the manufactured product. I was informed then that that was impossible of administration. What I want to bring to the attention of the committee now is that this particular compensatory duty, like the one next to be offered, is not predicated alone upon this duty of 10 per cent on long-staple cotton, of which we produce much less than 1,000,000 bales, but in its essence it lays a compensatory duty as if a duty based upon all raw cotton. It will increase the duty upon cotton goods made from all kinds of cotton, and it is impossible for you to get away from it. There is nothing said in this amendment about articles being made out of long-staple cotton. These laces are made not only out of long-staple but out of short-staple cotton, and the same thing will be true of your cotton cloth. I know the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] does not agree with the gentleman from Michigan about the impossibility of administering that law. At least I understood him so the other day.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This is an amendment to the lace paragraph. Surely the gentleman does not mean to claim that these laces can be made of short-staple cotton. That is certainly an error.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Whatever it may be, this compensatory duty takes into consideration all cotton manufactures, no matter what staple they are made from.

The same thing ought to happen to this amendment and to the next amendment, and for the very same reason, that happened to the compensatory duty on leather and boots and shoes on yesterday. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. STAFFORD. May we have the amendment reported again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Page 171, line 11, strike out the numerals "42" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "45."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The noes made the most noise.

Mr. FORDNEY. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 96, noes 89.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. GREEN of Iowa and Mr. OLDFIELD.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported—ayes 124, noes 118.

Accordingly the amendment of Mr. GREEN of Iowa was agreed to.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: Page 113, between lines 9 and 10, immediately preceding paragraph 901, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Manufactures of cotton composed wholly or in chief value of cotton having a staple of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches or more in length shall be dutiable at the rates provided in this schedule on manufactures of cotton, and in addition thereto  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent ad valorem."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, a day or two ago an amendment was adopted, offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BOWERS], placing a duty of 15 per cent on cotton of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches staple. This amendment which I am offering is simply a corollary following that action on the part of the House, adding a compensatory duty on the articles manufactured from cotton of that staple. It simply will place our manufacturers using cotton of that staple on an equality with foreign manufacturers. That is all there is to the amendment.

Mr. WYANT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I decline to yield unless I can get more time. Manufacturers abroad using long-staple cotton will, as a result of this action on the part of the House in adopting the amendment making the duty on long-staple cotton, have the benefit of 15 per cent in their use of the raw material. There-

fore it is right and proper that our manufacturers be placed on a parity with them. If this is not done, home industry will be decidedly handicapped and our workmen will be deprived of that amount of employment. Seven and a half per cent represents the actual duty on the raw product. Take, for instance, a yard of goods valued at \$1. The cotton of these goods will be about 50 per cent, or 50 cents, and the labor conversion will be an additional 50 cents. Add 15 per cent to the 50 per cent of the raw material and it brings the raw material up to 57½ cents, and the conversion, 50 cents, makes the goods worth \$1.07½, or 7½ per cent additional, and that is the duty asked for in this amendment.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I can not; I have not the time. I would be very glad to if I had. There are two or three points that I must refer to before my time expires. Long-staple cotton is used for two purposes—the higher grade of goods and automobile tires, in neither of which are we worried about the people being able to pay the additional rates. That is very essential. The other feature I desire to impress on the House is that it is said that it is impossible to determine whether long-staple cotton of an inch and an eighth is used in a fabric. The Treasury Department says it is difficult but not impossible. I hold in my hand a telegram from the users of long-staple cotton which says that it is perfectly feasible for the Treasury to examine the contents of the cloth and to determine whether or not cotton an inch and an eighth in length or more is used. It is therefore perfectly apparent, it seems to me, that if the House abides by its position and allows a duty of 15 per cent on inch and one-eighth long-staple cotton it must carry with it the compensatory duty. We do not ask for anything that will affect the price of the ordinary run of low-priced goods. Ninety-three per cent of the cotton cloth used in this country is made from the ordinary staple cotton. Only 7 per cent of the goods is affected by this amendment. As I have just said, it is of the kind of goods that the users can very well pay such increased cost as this amendment will cause. It will not affect a cent the value of the goods of the ordinary consumer of cotton cloth.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does not the gentleman think that the increase—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts have five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I object.

Mr. TREADWAY. Under permission given to extend my remarks, I append herewith a letter I am asked to place in the RECORD by the representatives of the large mills in New England. This letter shows how seriously the rates of this bill in the cotton schedule affect them:

BOSTON, MASS., July 18, 1921.

Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TREADWAY: I herewith inclose to you a letter which is the result of a long and serious conference among a large number of manufacturers representative not only of themselves but of a great many others.

I wish you would have this letter offered some time during the debate and made a matter of record, as well as to make such other use of it as may be proper and useful.

Very truly, yours,

WILLIAM M. BUTLER.

Officers representing the mills whose names are signed to the inclosed letter were present at the conference and authorized the signatures thereto.

BOSTON, MASS., July 18, 1921.

Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TREADWAY: Since the introduction of the new tariff bill the cotton schedule has had a careful study by quite a large number of different manufacturers, and as they begin to realize the effect of it as applied to many cloths that are made in New England mills they are becoming very much worried over the probable effects of it.

While the duties on some cloths of ordinary manufacture may not be objected to, the rates that have been applied to the finer grades and the more ornamental classes of cotton cloths are believed to be wholly inadequate to maintain the industry in this country. The additional cost of doing this class of work has not been recognized in the cotton schedule except in a few isolated cases.

We are informed that it is too late to have any changes made in the bill as reported to the House, but we want to be on record as having made a very vigorous protest against the bill as it now stands.

We wish there had been more time to study this bill. The principle upon which the bill is being written is very new, and it is very difficult to make applications of it in many cases, as the data does not exist, so that it has taken perhaps longer than it ought to understand something of its results, but the longer it is studied the more inconsistencies



are discovered, and we feel sure that unless it is modified in many respects New England will not be able to continue to manufacture many of the products it has been accustomed to make.

We trust that you will inform the committee of our position in the matter and have it become a matter of public record.

Very truly, yours,

HOOBAC COTTON MILLS.  
NEW BEDFORD COTTON MILLS CORPORATION.  
BUTLER MILL.  
NASHAWENA MILLS.  
PIERCE MANUFACTURING CO.  
PIERCE BROS. (LTD.).  
GRINNELL MANUFACTURING CORPORATION.  
CABOT MANUFACTURING CO.  
PAUL WHITTIN MANUFACTURING CO.  
GOSNOLD MILLS CO.  
PAGE MANUFACTURING CO.  
MANVILLE CO.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I have been a little amused at the statement of some gentlemen about the amount of this long-staple cotton  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length, and how we ought to encourage it. The gentleman from Michigan stated that we needed to encourage it in order to reduce the price. The cotton raisers do not want that. Let me give you the facts. Last year we made 1,008,000 bales, which is one-thirteenth of the whole crop. A million and eight thousand bales of it in the United States. How much have we imported this year? We have 1,008,000 of home supply and we have imported for the 11 months of the cotton year 84,000 bales, or less than 10 per cent. Now, you propose to put a compensatory duty on all goods in which there is used cotton of an inch and one-eighth and longer, and you propose to put compensatory duties on the whole business because a little less than 10 per cent of this is made of imported long-staple cotton. Is that according to the ideas of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. TREADWAY. That is not in accordance with the amendment I have offered.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman has offered an amendment to put compensatory duties on all goods made of cotton an inch and an eighth in length. We make a million bales in this country and import only 84,000 bales, and therefore 90 per cent of the goods made from cotton in this country pays no duty at all. [Applause.] The gentleman makes another statement that it is only in the fine goods that long staple is used. The gentleman forgets that sewing thread is made from long-staple cotton and that all the poorer people have to use sewing thread. The wife, who sits around the fireside and patches the trousers of her husband will have to pay this duty. Only 84,000 bales of Egyptian cotton comes in, and 1,000,000 pays no tariff that goes into this product.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Why did some of the Members on the Democratic side vote for the tax on long-staple cotton if we are importing so little?

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman will have to ask them. I did not do it. I think probably because they did not know any better.

Mr. HERRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I will.

Mr. HERRICK. I would like to have the gentleman give the House the benefit of his knowledge and tell us why the Arizona farmers now have 500,000 bales of long-staple cotton which they they can not sell.

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not believe it. The highest they have ever made in Arizona and California is 70,000 bales a year, and it would take several years to make 500,000 bales. In fact, since the crops of Arizona and California were large enough to be set out separately in the Government reports up to 1920, they have only produced 166,000 bales of long-staple cotton, and it was selling a year ago for \$1.50 a pound, and it is impossible to have 500,000 bales on hand, or the man who did not sell at \$1.50 per pound does not need tariff protection, but a guardian. There is no truth in the 500,000 bales of Arizona long-staple claim.

No such figure as that is to be found in the cotton reports of this country. Somebody has made a mistake or has been dreaming about figures. You have already put a tax of \$12,500,000 on the farmers of the South who make cotton in the matter of potash alone, and you are going to increase by this amendment the expenses of all of the cotton goods that they buy, because there will be enough long staple put into every yard of cloth made to raise the price to every farmer in the South. We object to having a little bagatelle of less than a hundred thousand bales of Egyptian cotton used to raise the cost of living to our people who make long-staple cotton, and who ask for no protection upon it, who can make it in competition with Egypt or anyone else. Egypt has had her crop cut down one-third this year by the English Government, because it was not a profitable

crop. It seems to me that the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] certainly ought not to prevail, considering that you are going to give 90 per cent of protection to something that does not need it.

Now, I desire to discuss this potash question, which enters into the cost of cotton. We use annually 250,000 tons of potash—pure potash—and a tax of \$50 a ton on that is \$12,500,000 tax levied principally on the cotton farmers of the South for the benefit of potash producers of the West on whose product the freight rate alone is prohibitive. Confessedly this is to enable those people to develop their industry so that the Nation will have an independent supply. The attorney for these people says in his brief, page 17, that this will fall on the Southeastern States. Now, why tax the Southeast for the benefit of all? Let the Government give this industry a bounty, which will be borne by all the people if it must be nursed. Do not penalize the cotton farmer to build up national defense. I bought 12 per cent German kainite this year at \$18 a ton. It has 12 units potash to the ton. Under this bill at 50 cents to the unit the price would have been \$24 a ton, 33 per cent higher. I am informed that it can now be bought at \$12 a ton, but the \$6 tariff or 50 per cent increase in price will be a fixed charge and is indefensible.

Again, the excess of iron in the western product has destroyed thousands of dollars of crops in our country, and it is not yet refined so as to suit our crops. Finally, the freight from California to South Carolina is prohibitive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. LUCE rose.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALSH). For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Just a little more than 100 years ago, in the year 1818, a man from the State of the gentleman who has just preceded me [Mr. STEVENSON], a Representative from South Carolina, who was to become famous, John C. Calhoun, visited the town of Waltham, in Massachusetts, where I now live, and viewed with satisfaction and commendation a little factory recently built on the banks of the River Charles, where had been installed the first power loom successfully used in this country. John C. Calhoun rejoiced that two years previously he had supported William Lowndes, also of South Carolina, in putting a protective tariff on the statute books, though it had been against the protest of every man from Massachusetts. Two years later, in 1820, the foremost citizen of my State, Harrison Gray Otis, then a Senator, by his vote—and to him may be given the credit, I think, because of the speech that he had made—broke a tie and defeated another high-protective tariff. In 1824 Henry Clay came out of the Southwest, as it was then, with his great speech on "The American system." He was followed by Daniel Webster, who spoke against the tariff, and every vote in Massachusetts but one was cast against that measure. Thus against our will you laid the foundation of our factories, you drove our commerce off the seas, you tied up our ships at the rotting wharves of Newburyport and Salem and Boston; you forced us to become a manufacturing community.

Lo, the changes that followed. John C. Calhoun became the most intense free trader, and Daniel Webster, because of what the grandfathers of you men from South Carolina and Kentucky had done—because the South and West had made New England an industrial community—found the importance of the tariff to his State to be such that he was warranted in becoming a protectionist. In 1846, in condemning the Walker tariff, Webster pointed out precisely the same thing I denounce now. He pointed out the absurdity, the folly, of putting a tariff on raw material and at the same time permitting the manufactured product to enter free.

Speaking of the tariff of 1824, he delivered himself of this notable sentence:

For one, I resolved then, and have acted upon the resolution ever since, that, having compelled the Eastern States to go into these pursuits for a livelihood, the country was bound to fulfill the just expectations which it had inspired.

In that debate, in every debate on the tariff, may be found manifestations of a strange prejudice against the child of your grandfathers, a strange attempt from other parts of the country to stifle and throttle the enterprises that they created. I ask you to consider whether it is just to the region that you made a hive of industry, just to the hundreds of factories whose chimneys I can see from the highest hill in my town, just to the thousands of men who work in those factories for a wage—I ask whether it is just and fair and right by such legislation as you are enacting here now, by the duty on hides without a compensatory tariff on boots and shoes, by the duty on cotton with-

out a compensatory tariff on cotton goods, to drive across the seas the manufacture of these raw materials into the finished product?

In Bombay I watched a never-ending line of bullock carts carrying bales of cotton to great factories, and I said to myself the day is not far distant when the planters of our Southern States will demand protection against the wretched orientals who toil for a pittance. Shall you have that protection against those who slave under an Indian sun, and deny it to us against those who slave under a Bombay roof?

I have seen, too, that wonderful delta of the Nile, fertilized by the mud from the regions of the Equator, blossoming under English skill. Already you are asking that its cotton may not compete in our markets with the staple of Arizona and California, but is that to be under conditions letting the mills of Lancashire and Saxony sell the products of their looms cheaper in New York than like goods can be sold by the factories of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts? Is it better for us to have American cotton spun by English or German than by American spindles?

From beyond the sea comes that which enables our factories to prosper, and which makes you prosper, because we prosper. I beg of you to permit us to live under the system that you forced upon us. I beg of you to permit us to continue to manufacture in this country both what you produce and what other lands produce. I beg you of the South and West to let us continue in New England a manufacturing community that through your creation has become the leader of the world in skill, in industry, in utility. With your permission, if you will but continue the just expectations that you have inspired, if you will but let us work, we will do our share, as we have done it now for a hundred years, in making this land prosperous. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Of course, I do not care to answer the historical disquisition of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE]; it would take a long time to go into it, and I am not prepared to, nor do I care to do it now. But I do want to have something to say with reference to my beloved colleague from Texas [Mr. GARNER] in respect to the position which he has taken. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] and myself start out with the same premise, the same declaration of principles. I agree with him that there are and can be but three schools on the tariff: Those who favor free trade—that is, no tariff; those who favor a tariff for revenue only; and those who favor a tariff for protection. I believe every tariff is levied for protection or for revenue. If my friend is for a duty for revenue only, then he and I will have no quarrel, because he and I will both ignore all question of benefit and we will levy the tariff in such a way as to get the most revenue with the least burden to the people; but, unfortunately, after we lay down our premises we part company. I know that if my only purpose in levying a tariff is to obtain a certain amount of revenue for the Government, I will necessarily seek to so arrange it that it will get the revenue and impose the least possible burden on the whole people.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. If the gentleman will give me 10 minutes; I have only 5 minutes. I want to say this, that the minute a gentleman commences to talk about the benefits to be conferred by a tariff he and I part company. If he is looking to the right side or to the left to discover a benefit to some man or class of men whom he would help—

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I told the gentleman I could not. The gentleman should not keep on interrupting me. Whenever a Democrat begins to be tempted by the benefits to be received by a tariff he is sure to have his vision clouded and forget the burden he is imposing while looking at the benefit he is bestowing on his friends, and he is no longer following the flag of a tariff for revenue only. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman says that he would so model his tariff as to grade from 1 to 50 per cent. That means he would arrange it for the purpose of protection.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman can not find in any statement I have ever made where I spoke of the benefits to be derived from a tariff, nor can the gentleman show where I said that I would levy it for protection scaling from 1 to 50 per cent.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I understood the gentleman to say he would scale his tax from 1 to 50 per cent ad valorem. It was my conclusion that the scaling would become the ready means of protection. I want to say that there is no man in this House who has a higher regard for the gentleman from

Texas than I have. I simply base my conclusion also on the votes the gentleman casts. The gentleman did not, I think, use the word benefits, but, in substance, he has been advocating equal protection, and I want to say that the gentleman who is so ably and eloquently preaching the doctrine of equal protection, in doing so is preaching the doctrine of protection from the North to the South as a policy for the benefit of the men to be protected, and whenever you levy a duty on long-staple cotton for protection, whenever you levy a duty on hides for protection, you have no right to object to a compensatory duty for the manufacturer. We have no right to criticize the manufacturer for wanting a protective tariff if we want one on our products. Of course, I will not have time, but I want to say that the teaching and votes of the gentleman will not stand with the doctrine of a tariff for revenue only. That doctrine is that being forced to levy a tariff by the necessity of raising revenue, Democrats will so levy it as to impose the least burden upon the country while raising the greatest revenue for the Government. That is Democratic doctrine, and when you start out with a duty on hides you are going to follow with a compensatory duty, even though that is a heavy burden, and you must do it, because you can not put the manufacturer at a disadvantage of paying more for his raw material and then expect him to compete with those competitors who do not pay a duty on the raw material. You put 15 cents a pound on raw wool, and the manufacturer must have a compensatory duty to enable him to compete with the foreign importer in the sale of his goods, and so far no tariff has ever been laid on such articles without giving a compensatory duty. You just adopted a compensatory duty a moment ago on the manufacture of lace goods out of long-staple cotton, after putting a duty on such cotton, and the compensatory duty logically followed the cotton duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me say, further, that neither can we favor every tariff that would produce revenue. The gentleman and I both voted for the farmers' free list, and I think we both voted gladly for free lumber in the Underwood bill and would gladly do so again if given the chance in this bill, and I think he and I would both vote gladly to put a good many articles on the free list, both because they are articles in everyday use by the man of small means, the man least able to bear the tax, and because we believe that the home manufacturer, if we put a tariff on them, would have a monopoly of the home market and the home consumer would pay higher prices while the Government would collect no revenue from the tax. This was our reason for passing the farmers' free list, and the results justified our action fully.

The gentleman in defending his vote for a tariff on hides, to be followed, if it remains in the bill, by a duty on shoes and harness and all leather, as we both know, declares that a duty on shoes is no worse than a duty on clothing. I call his attention to one great difference: The imports of shoes and leather goods into this country, with or without a duty, has been so small that the revenue obtainable would be insignificant, while our exports of leather goods is nearly 50 per cent of all the leather we make. Our shoe manufacturers, with shoes on the free list, now sell us all our shoes and sell shoes by the millions of pairs all over the world, so that a duty on shoes at least would simply enable the home manufacturer to raise his prices still higher to the consumer and yet bring in no revenue. Shoes are now on the free list. Let us keep them there.

If there are any other articles of clothing in the same situation as shoes and leather goods, they, too, ought to be on the free list, and if there are duties in this bill, as there are, so high as to exclude foreign competition in those goods, those duties ought to be lowered to the point where they would permit both imports and revenue—the greatest amount of revenue obtainable. Mr. Chairman, in 1909, after the passage of the Payne-Aldrich bill, there was quite a debate in Texas between W. J. Bryan and J. W. Bailey, and I was asked to discuss the issues between them. I did so in a speech at Cameron, Tex. What I said then seems to be pertinent and equally true now, save that in proposing compensatory duties now protectionists do not overdo the compensation as much as they did then. They do not now, for example, ask a 10 per cent duty on the finished shoe as a compensation for a 10 per cent duty on the hide in the shoe, but, in the main, the argument I made then meets the arguments advanced by my friend Mr. GARNER to-day. I therefore avail myself of the privilege of extending my remarks by including parts of that speech.

I voted with 14 other Texas Democrats for a duty on hides. I made a speech in favor of it. I think my speech as strong as any speech can be made for that duty. After I heard Mr. Bryan at Dallas I still believed I had been right, but after I read his speech in cold type I began to have doubts. I read four old speeches of Roger Q. Mills, the greatest tariff student and statesman and champion of the "for-



gotten man" Democracy has produced. I have studied no other question for three weeks, and I am convinced I was wrong. I prepared to give you a historical and platform review of the question of free raw material, but for lack of time I must reserve it. You do not care, anyhow, so much to know what the fathers taught or said as you do to know what is the interest of the people as distinguished from any class or special interest. Mr. Bailey says "the friends of protection in this day realize (and he should have added for many a long year have realized) that from its peculiar nature it would not be sustained by public sentiment unless its favors are extended to every class who can possibly participate in them, and they have adopted the plan of giving all protection at the selling end of the transaction. They are wise enough to understand that they can not advocate free trade in what the manufacturers must buy and protection on what they must sell without arraying against them every producer of raw material, and their maxim is 'Protection for everybody.'"

This, I think, is a true statement of the Republican and protection position to-day. In stating the maxim of protectionists Mr. Bailey has stated precisely the substance of the position of those Democrats like himself who are contending for as broad a "distribution of the effects of tariff" as possible. If Mr. Bailey represents Democracy and has correctly stated the present position of the friends of protection, the lion and the lamb now lie down together.

Mr. Bailey and Mr. WARREN and Mr. Burroughs, Republicans in the Senate, argue for a tax on raw material, first, because they say it has as much right to the benefits of the tariff as has the finished product. That is exactly true, but neither one has any such right.

You do not wrong the raw material man when you refuse to put a tariff on his product and thereby raise its price any more than you wrong the cotton producer by refusing to give him a bounty on his cotton. A bounty and a price-raising duty are the same thing to the producer. But if you put a price-raising duty on the raw material, which forms any considerable portion of the finished product, you must put at least a compensatory duty on the finished product. Mr. Bailey denies this, but that it is true is recognized by every candid man, whether he be protectionist or free trader.

No tariff bill was ever written imposing a tariff on such raw materials that did not impose a duty on the finished product large enough to enable the manufacturer to collect from the ultimate consumer enough to pay him back the duty which he paid on the raw material with interest and profits added, and no bill has ever been passed that did not add to this compensatory duty enough to give an additional protection to the finished product equal to that afforded on the raw material.

Notwithstanding Mr. Bailey to the contrary, I say when you put a tax on raw material you are bound to let the finished-product man collect that tax back from the consumer. Let me demonstrate this proposition. I use Mr. Mill's illustration: Two manufacturers in the open market in London buy wool, one an American, the other an Englishman. The Englishman buys 4 pounds of wool at 15 cents per pound, making 60 cents, and pays no tax. He takes it to his factory and puts 30 cents' worth of labor on it, and since it takes 4 pounds of raw wool to make 1 pound of cloth, he produces 1 pound of cloth at a total cost of 90 cents. The American buys the same amount of the same wool at 15 cents per pound. He brings it to the port of New York and under the present tariff of 11 cents per pound pays 44 cents duty, making the cost to him when he gets it to his factory \$1.04. He then puts into it 30 cents in labor to produce 1 pound of cloth, at a total cost of \$1.34, or 44 cents more than it cost the English manufacturer. Now, if you do not put a duty upon that cloth, but put it on the free list, as advised by Mr. Bailey, what happens? The Englishman sends his cloth into our markets free of duty, and necessarily drives our manufacturers out of business.

#### WOOLGROWERS.

What else happens? When the American cloth maker quits business where will the American woolgrower sell his wool? Do I need to answer? He must go to the foreign market, and after paying the freight sell it for 15 cents per pound in the open market instead of selling it for 26 cents per pound at home under protection, for you are aware that protection can do no good to the products that must find their markets abroad, and so we get back to the proposition that when you protect the raw material you must also protect the finished product to an extent, at least, equal to the duty on raw material, and that means that the manufacturer collects from the consumer the tax he pays on his raw material.

But that is only half the full truth. If you only wished to compensate the manufacturer in this wool example on that pound of cloth, you would give him a tariff of 44 cents only. The Englishman would then have to pay the same tax on his cloth that the American paid on his wool, and they would compete on equal terms for the American consumer's trade. But that is never done.

The manufacturer and the wool man always, under the very motive stated by Mr. Bailey, agree that each of them shall be protected and that they will get protection for both at the selling end, and so, after they give the wool man 11 cents per pound on his wool, they give the cloth man, first, 44 cents per pound on his cloth to compensate him, and then 60 per cent ad valorem for his own protection. The wool man not only always has and always will but he absolutely must join the manufacturer in demanding a duty on cloth, and no wool man will ever join Mr. Bailey in asking to take off either the compensatory or the added duty from the cloth.

#### BAILEY AND HIDES.

Even Mr. Bailey proposes a duty of 10 per cent on hides, with a duty of 10 per cent on leather and shoes, and in doing so proposes a more than compensatory duty to the manufacturer.

Let me show you.

Suppose the American shoe man buys and puts into his shoe 30 cents, at foreign price, of hides. He pays the hide tax, 10 per cent, or 3 cents, and he puts in with it 70 cents' worth of labor to make the shoe. The shoe has cost him \$1.03. The Englishman bought the same hide at 30 cents, paid no tax and put in with it 70 cents labor. The shoe has cost him \$1. Mr. Bailey's law would then levy a tariff of 10 per cent upon the total English cost of the shoe, so that when he collected his tribute from the consumer the American shoe man would collect from him, first, the 3-cent tax he paid on the hide and then 7 cents protection on his labor, which would give him just the same degree of protection given on the hide. But it would result in the consumer being out 10 cents, while the Government received only 3 cents. If you had taken that duty off of the hide and reduced the duty on the shoe to 3 per cent, you would have gotten the same revenue and the consumer have paid 7 cents less.

But if revenue and not protection is what you want, let us take Mr. Bailey's Democratic law—10 per cent duty on hides and 10 per cent on shoes—further: Now, suppose there were raised \$2,100,000 net revenue on imported hides of which to make shoes, giving the hide percentage and the labor percentage of value in the finished shoe at 30 per cent hide and 70 per cent labor, under Mr. Bailey's law to raise \$2,100,000 revenue on hides for shoes to be made and sold here, you would import \$21,000,000 worth of hides, foreign price, and the shoe man would pay that \$2,100,000 duty into the Treasury. He would then put in labor 70 per cent of the total foreign cost of the shoe. The total foreign cost of the shoes would be \$21,000,000 hides, plus \$49,000,000 labor; total, \$70,000,000. On this sum Mr. Bailey's law would give 10 per cent, or \$7,000,000, protection to the American shoe man to be paid by the home consumer. Thus the Treasury would receive \$2,100,000 and the consumer bear \$7,000,000 burden. If hides had been free, you could have raised the same revenue by a duty of exactly 3 per cent on the imported shoes. And so every duty on raw material actually costs the consumer two to five times what it would have been levied on the finished product.

#### BRYAN'S CONTENTION.

Now, that is so plain that a wayfaring man, though a fool, if he is trying to lessen the burdens of the consumer, can see it, and it establishes Mr. Bryan's contention that the cheapest tax you can levy on the consumer is the tax on the product at its last stage before it reaches the consumer.

The question of free raw material, however, is wider than wool and cloth and hides and shoes and iron ore and steel. What's the matter with the American flag on the ocean? Nothing; only it's a free finished product with a taxed raw material, and it flies or floats no more. You can't build ships for the ocean—free ships—out of taxed iron and steel. Republicans and protection Democrats will not take the tax off of the raw materials of ships, but would float the flag by subsidies larger than all the tax we get from iron and steel and all their products. With free iron ore, God's gift and blessing, which we ought to be willing to receive; free iron and steel which we do make at less cost than anybody on earth, and free ships our keels will plow all seas, our vessels cast anchor in all ports, and our flag wave by the side of England's before all peoples.

I do not believe you can levy a tax on the raw material without levying it on the finished product. I do not believe you can levy a tax on both without making the people's burden heavier than it ought to be and making the people pay far more than the Government gets in revenue.

But there is one statement of Mr. Bailey's I do believe. He says, "It is plain that we have reached a point in our industrial development where our manufacturers must find a market for our surplus goods, and we are told that if Congress will take the tariff off raw materials American manufacturers can produce their goods at a cost which will enable them to successfully compete in the markets of the world against the manufacturers of other countries." If the American manufacturer with free raw material can ship his products to foreign markets and, after paying ocean freights and insurance upon them, can sell them in competition with foreign rivals, he can certainly take the free raw material and, saving ocean freight and insurance, hold the American market against foreign goods which have been compelled to pay ocean freights and insurance. With every word of that statement I agree, but I would not correct one wrong by perpetrating another upon the people. I would not lay one cent of tariff for protection of any kind to anybody, but even for revenue I would not lay a 10 per cent tax to collect 3 per cent revenue. I have shown that with a tariff on his raw material our manufacturer can not sell as cheaply at home as the foreigner can if you let the foreigner's finished product come in free. Neither can he pay such tax and sell abroad as cheaply as the foreigner, unless you give him a drawback, and this is what all parties in all bills have done. When you tax his raw material and give that drawback you provide by law that his exports shall cost him less than his goods sold at home, and so force him to charge more for his goods at home than abroad in order to make the same profit.

#### RAW MATERIAL.

If we wish to buy our own manufactures as cheaply at home as they are sold abroad we must repeal our duties on raw material. That will eliminate the drawback clause of the tariff bill, and then let us make it a crime for any manufacturer of tariff-protected goods to sell for the foreign market cheaper than he does at home, and then, with the dwindling list of beneficiaries under the tariff and the masses of the people growing more opposed to tariff burdens, we will put the products of the manufacturer, one at a time, or all at one time, on the free list.

I want to impress upon you further that every raw material man on earth, when you put a duty on his product will agree with and join the manufacturer in giving him a compensatory duty and an added duty on the finished product, while if you take the duty off the raw material he helps you to lower and fight the duty on the finished product.

In the House, when the duty on hides was removed, although it affected only a small portion of the leather used in shoes, there was a reduction on leather and shoes more than equal to the amount of the duty on hides. When the schedule came up in the Senate Mr. Aldrich submitted the hide proposition first, and said he withheld the leather schedule until he should find what was done with hides. The Senate put a duty on hides, and Mr. Aldrich then brought in his leather schedule, on which there was more than a compensatory duty. The conference committee struck out the duty on hides, and accompanied that action by reducing the duty on leather and its products, so that, if the people wanted a lower duty on shoes, they got it by repealing the duty on hides.

#### NO INFANT INDUSTRIES.

Again I say we have no infant industries. Why should we or any of us need protection? The combinations, the fraud, and lies of those clamoring for protection to protect our laboring men against the pauper labor of Europe are too clear to fool the sensible laboring man longer. Those same protectionists own factories or interest in factories both here and in Europe. Here they want protection against the pauper labor of Germany and France; there they want protection against the skilled labor of America. The same selfish interests control the Governments both here and there and rob the masses in each country separately by forming trusts to raise the prices of their products and to oppress labor as far as they dare, while in its name they demand laws under which they pile up the millions of their blood-stained fortunes.

The great Steel Trust at Pittsburgh demands protection for American labor and imports its employees from so-called pauper Europe. They can't speak our language; they work seven days in the week, and don't know when Sunday comes. To protect this kind of American labor the trusts demand a tariff. Why, Mr. Carnegie himself testified on oath that his Pittsburgh mills can and do produce at a less actual cost than any mill on earth.

But I call you to witness did any wool Senator help lower the steel tariff? New England, the home of protection, is importing its labor by the millions until her population is no longer mainly American. She is grinding both foreign and American born workers while demanding in their name of us who are yet free, thank God, in the land of the farm and the plow, that we pay her a tribute from our toil greater than any ever gathered from subject nations of Asia. But did any wool Senator help to lower the tax on textiles? No; the wool men and the woolen-cloth men met in Chicago and fixed their joint schedule. I am tired of the cry of protection, whether it be for Pennsylvania, for New England, or for my nearest neighbor.

I am tired forevermore. Henceforth my intention is to vote every time I get a chance to put every article of common use on the free list, whether it be raw material or finished product. I will vote to put the finished product there; I know that will bring the raw material. I will vote to put the raw material there; I know that will help to put the finished product on the free list, and I intend to vote for every reduction except on luxuries that is proposed on any article I can not get on the free list. All protected interests are banded together through life and unto death to rob the people. I shall cut them off fore and aft whenever and however I can.

Just one thing more from Mr. Bailey. He quotes Mr. Bryan as follows: "The third argument I desire to present in favor of free raw material is that the tax is generally lightest which is imposed on the products at the most advanced stage. If the tax increased the price of the product—and it can be of no benefit to a protected industry unless it does—that increase grows every time it passes through a new stage of manufacture. Each one who handles the product exacts a profit not only upon the original price but upon the tariff, and the tax grows like a snowball. The consumer therefore finds that other things being equal, the tax is cheapest when levied upon the finished product only because it is levied but once."

Mr. Bailey replies: "The main fact which Mr. Bryan recites as justifying the doctrine of free raw material produces exactly the opposite conviction in my mind. He says that each one who handles the products exacts a profit not only upon the original price but upon the tariff. If this be true, then instead of being an objection to levying a tax upon the raw material it becomes an argument in favor of it because it establishes what all Democrats so much desire, the wider distribution of the effects of the tariff tax, which must inevitably reduce its benefits to some and its burdens to others."

Now, that seems to me absolutely amazing. If the manufacturer buys wool in London to import and pays into the Treasury 10 cents per pound duty, makes it into cloth, and sells it to the clothing manufacturer at a profit of 10 per cent, and the clothier sells it to the consumer at a profit of 10 per cent, both the clothmaker and the clothier actually making a profit on the tax; that, says Mr. Bailey, is the most Democratic tax of all, because more people have gotten some benefits from the tax. He absolutely forgets that after all these profits have been added to the tax the poor consumer bears the burden and pays for it all.

And you are the consumer, you are Roger Q. Mills's "forgotten man," you are W. J. Bryan's "common people," and this is J. W. Bailey's "logic," and he seems to say it seriously.

#### DEMOCRATIC DISSENSIONS.

In conclusion, I don't know why all this discussion has broken out at this time, but I do know that if every Democrat in Congress had stood by the demands of the Denver platform there would be no such discussion among us to-day. The discussion has brought out a new school of Democrats. They tell us to put tariff on as many articles as possible, but make it no higher on any than would invite and permit genuine competition between the home and foreign products, and thus no higher than the rate that would produce the very highest revenue from each article; but I know that the moment you get all these articles on the taxed list, incidentally or intentionally protected, you set up a hunger and thirst and greed in the producer of each of them and they combine and clamor for more incidental protection until you get more and more prohibitive protection and less and less accidental revenue, and so the tariff stands to-day by the avowed purpose of the Republicans for protection first and revenue last and least; and the greatest hindrance in the way of an income tax to-day is the fear that it will kill protection. I know all this. Other men, like Mr. Bailey, seem not to know it.

I have seen Louisiana, on account of sugar, lumber, and rice, turn protectionist to the core, and she would be Republican to-day but for the race problem. I firmly believe. I have seen California, in spite of her Chinese and Japanese problems, which would have made her Democratic, stand by the Republican Party on account of the high protection for her oranges, lemons, and lumber.

I saw two Democrats from Missouri last year lose their seats to two Republicans because Mr. CANNON went into their district and told their people that the Republicans would give them the duty they wanted on zinc if they would elect Republicans to Congress, and as a result the duty on zinc was doubled, and last month only 12 cars of zinc ore were shipped from Mexico into the United States, instead of 190 cars per month, as heretofore, with loss of revenue to the Government and increased price of zinc products to the people.

Hell never devised a means to breed corruption and to tempt the virtue and fidelity to principle of a people equal to protection. The Republicans would keep protection alive; therefore, they bring all the classes they can under its fold to give it strength and life. I would kill it, and therefore I would take all the classes I can without its pale to destroy its strength and give it death.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, a division. I want to say I have an amendment to the amendment to offer in good faith.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt—

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 121, noes 72.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers [Mr. FORDNEY and Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee] announced that there were—ayes 118, noes 84.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is adopted and debate is exhausted.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment, to strike out the words "or in chief value."

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I did not understand that the gentleman from Tennessee had an amendment to this amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to offer that amendment and address the House for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment of Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee to the amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: Strike out the words "or in chief value."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may proceed to address the committee for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I tried to get the Chair to recognize me to offer an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Certainly I object if the gentleman from Chicago is so impatient.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee) there were—ayes 89, noes 81.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. More than 20 have arisen; a sufficient number, and tellers are ordered.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what the amendment to the amendment is, so that we can vote intelligently.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment will be again reported.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The committee again divided; and the tellers [Mr. TREADWAY and Mr. GARNER] reported that there were—ayes 122, noes 85.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. FORDNEY. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 50, noes 122.

So the amendment as amended was rejected.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. FORDNEY: Page 346, line 4, insert the word "and" after the comma between "3" and "4" and strike out "and 5."

Mr. FORDNEY. I will say to the gentleman this committee amendment was one of the amendments offered last night to correct an error made in the time of the examiners in the office over in New York. This is necessary—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that the RECORD shows that this amendment was agreed to on yesterday.

Mr. FORDNEY. Then I offer the next amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 346, line 4, insert the word "and" after the comma between "3" and "4" and strike out "and 5."

Mr. STEVENSON. That is the same thing, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that we have voted on this amendment two times already.



The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that that was also voted on.

Mr. FORDNEY. Page 346, line 1—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his amendment?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do, and ask the Clerk to read the next one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 346, lines 1 and 2, strike out "act of March 4, 1909, chapter 314."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, what is this?

Mr. FORDNEY. There was an error made in striking out some of the statutes by the bill presented. It overlooked a very recent act fixing an 8-hour day for the examiners in the customhouse in New York.

Mr. WINGO. Is this in addition to the amendment you had yesterday?

Mr. FORDNEY. It is one of them. Four or five were necessary in order to make that one correction.

Mr. WINGO. This act to which you refer is the act which fixes the 8-hour day?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. And you strike out all of the repealing provision of this act?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; and leave the law as it is, making an 8-hour day for these men.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORDNEY. I have one more amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 341, line 5, strike out the numerals "2733," and in line 6 strike out the numerals "2737."

Mr. FORDNEY. It has the same purpose. There is no other change whatever.

Mr. WINGO. Has that reference to the same act?

Mr. FORDNEY. It has reference to the same act; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that, on page 28, line 23, the word "per." be changed to "par."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to offer an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 23, strike out "per." and insert "par."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Reserving the right to object, is that a typographical error? The gentleman will recall I asked yesterday to get permission by unanimous consent to correct all typographical errors and misspelling, and things of that sort. I think you ought to renew it in order to save time.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think we are almost through with that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

Page 15, line 9, change the word "possession" to "possessions."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 9, strike out the word "possession" and insert in lieu thereof the word "possessions."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in behalf of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, because a few of us from Texas, on behalf of the deserving producers of our State, have voted for a reasonable revenue-producing tariff on foreign-raised corn, cotton, wool, wheat, beans, potatoes, peanuts, rice, oils, cattle, sheep, hides, frozen meats, and other products raised by American farmers, the balance of our Texas colleagues have been throwing one political spasm after another. They are afraid that we have impaired our standing as Democrats. They

have been so interested in somebody else's standing that they have sadly neglected their own. They have forgotten that in the Underwood tariff bill, a Democratic measure, they voted for a substantial import tariff on sugar, molasses, honey, figs, grapes, lemons, pineapples, tobacco, household and kitchen furniture, table and kitchen utensils, blacksmith's tools, grindstones, soaps, pens, ink, perfumery, steel and iron; every manufactured article of cotton goods used by a farmer and every article manufactured out of wool used by our producers, while they left on the free list practically all of the products raised on the American farms and ranches. In other words, they forced our American producers to sell all of their products on a free market competing with the cheap peon and coolie labor of the whole world, and then forced them to buy all of their necessities on a protected market. I deny that this is Democratic.

Such an arrangement may suit my colleague Mr. BLACK, but if his constituents in east Texas think as do mine in the seventeenth district they will rebel against his leadership.

Under the Democratic Underwood tariff measure this Government collected through the customhouses in 1920 import duties aggregating \$322,000,000. Apparently my colleagues, headed by my friend Mr. BLACK, can not understand that when they collect \$322,000,000 import duties in one year through the customhouses under their approved Democratic Underwood tariff measure they ipso facto protect incidentally the business interests handling those particular commodities in America. And they protected such business interests in 1920 to the tune of \$322,000,000. If they could protect the Steel Trust and the New England manufacturers, why could not they protect the farmers?

I call on my colleague Mr. BLACK to tell me and his east Texas farmers what Democratic rule or Democratic platform is there that prevents Democrats from including products of the farms and ranches among the hundreds of articles upon which they must levy import duties to collect \$322,000,000? There is no such rule or platform in Democracy.

I am a Democrat. I was born a Democrat. I have been a Democrat all my life—nearly 49 years. I am against monopolies. I am for the masses. I am therefore for the producers of this country who feed and clothe our 110,000,000 people. They constitute no monopoly. They have been robbed in every conceivable manner for over a hundred years. Gradually their boys have been driven from their farms because of starvation prices for their products—the result of a whole year's toil.

My friend Mr. BLACK and his followers in the Texas delegation approve of placing the farmers' wheat on the free list in the Underwood Act, and by reason thereof, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, there were 4,744,712 bushels of wheat imported from foreign countries into the United States, absolutely free of duty, to compete with and reduce the price of wheat raised by our American farmers; and during the four months of July, August, September, and October, 1920, there were 12,040,541 bushels of foreign wheat imported, duty free, into the United States.

And my friend Mr. BLACK and his followers in the Texas delegation approve of placing the farmers' corn upon the free list in the Underwood Act, and by reason thereof, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, there were 10,229,249 bushels of corn imported from foreign countries into the United States absolutely free of duty, to compete with and reduce the price of corn raised by our American farmers; and during the four months succeeding such fiscal year there were 5,317,376 bushels of corn imported from foreign countries, duty free, into the United States.

And my friend Mr. BLACK and his followers in the Texas delegation approve of placing the farmers' cotton upon the free list in the Underwood Act, and by reason thereof during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, there were 345,314,126 pounds of cotton imported from foreign countries absolutely free of duty into the United States; and during the four months succeeding such fiscal year there were 42,961,691 pounds of foreign cotton shipped into the United States absolutely free of duty.

And my friend Mr. BLACK and his followers in the Texas delegation approve of placing on the free list such American producers' products as wheat flour, wool, beef and veal, mutton and lamb, cattle, sheep, cowhides, calf hides, other hides, oil cake, and substitute vegetable oils, such as was done in the Underwood Act, and by reason thereof during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, there was shipped from foreign countries into the United States absolutely free of duty the following:

Wheat flour	barrels	157, 896
Wool	pounds	427, 578, 038
Beef and veal	do	42, 436, 333
Mutton and lamb	do	16, 358, 299
Cattle	head	575, 328
Sheep	do	199, 549

Cowhides.....	pounds.....	439,461,092
Calf hides.....	do.....	68,359,825
Cabretta hides.....	do.....	101,848
Buffalo hides.....	do.....	14,682,279
Other hides.....	do.....	275,964,213
Oil cake.....	do.....	145,026,652
Vegetable oils:		
Chinese nut oil.....	gallons.....	10,613,638
Coconut oil.....	pounds.....	269,226,966
Cottonseed oil.....	do.....	24,164,821
Palm oil.....	do.....	50,103,387
Palm-kernel oil.....	do.....	53,508
Olive oil, for manufacturing.....	gallons.....	216,145
Soya-bean oil.....	pounds.....	195,773,594
Other oils.....	worth.....	\$1,542,271

And during the four months succeeding said fiscal year, to wit, July, August, September, and October, 1920, there were imported into the United States from foreign countries absolutely free of duty under the provisions of the Underwood Act, approved by Mr. BLACK and his followers in the Texas delegation, the following products to freely compete with American farms and ranches, to wit:

Wheat flour.....	barrels.....	221,989
Wool.....	pounds.....	44,435,246
Beef and veal.....	do.....	19,456,961
Mutton and lamb.....	do.....	64,623,776
Cattle.....	head.....	142,139
Sheep.....	do.....	94,960
Cowhides.....	pounds.....	80,023,347
Calf hides.....	do.....	10,782,491
Cabretta hides.....	do.....	488
Buffalo hides.....	do.....	3,270,450
Other hides.....	do.....	53,013,186
Oil cake.....	do.....	128,615,571
Vegetable oils:		
Chinese nut oil.....	gallons.....	3,354,901
Coconut oil.....	pounds.....	62,402,486
Cottonseed oil.....	do.....	62,579,172
Palm oil.....	do.....	12,962,010
Palm-kernel oil.....	do.....	1,403,651
Olive oil, for manufacturing.....	gallons.....	9,896
Soya-bean oil.....	pounds.....	26,923,725
Other oils.....	worth.....	\$378,053

My friend Mr. BLACK and his followers in the Texas delegation approve of the Underwood steel schedule, protecting all of the steel and iron products, to further enrich the big Steel Trust; they approve of the Underwood schedule placing high duties on cotton thread, cotton cloth, cotton handkerchiefs, cotton stockings, cotton shirts, cotton drawers, cotton pants, cotton vests, cotton union suits, cotton corset covers, cotton underwear, cotton clothing of all kinds, cotton sheets, cotton pillowcases, cotton towels, cotton napkins, and all manufactured articles of cotton; they approve of the Underwood schedule placing high duties upon all finished articles manufactured from wool; they approve of the Underwood schedule placing high duties upon toilet soaps and perfumery, so that only the rich might afford these common necessities; they approve of the Underwood schedule placing a high duty upon soda and potash and several hundred other articles in daily use in every household, which our farmers and laborers must buy; all this to Mr. BLACK is Democratic; but when it comes to selecting a few of the products raised by our sturdy producers on the farms and ranches as proper items upon which to raise import revenues then it is all un-Democratic and all wrong to our Democratic Mr. BLACK and his blind followers.

If it is Democratic under an Underwood Act to levy import duties upon products of the gigantic Steel Trust, affording this monster monopoly incidental protection, then why is it, Mr. BLACK, not likewise Democratic, later on, when our country must collect through the customhouses \$500,000,000 in import duties, to levy reasonable import duties upon farm and ranch products, thus affording incidental protection to worthy and deserving producers?

No Congressman in this House will deny that it is necessary for our Government to collect through the customhouses \$500,000,000 from import duties. I pause to give any an opportunity to deny it, and none deny it. Then if it is now necessary for our Government to collect annually through the customhouses \$500,000,000 from import duties, how are you Democrats going to escape the responsibility of properly distributing the incidental protection that is created ipso facto from the levy of this amount of duties? Are you going to do as my friend Mr. BLACK does, blindly shut your eyes, take the bit in your mouth, and contend that because certain Democratic leaders gave most of this incidental protection of \$322,000,000 annually to the Steel Trust, and to the big cotton manufacturers of New England, and none to the farmers and producers, we must forsooth now repeat this wrong and again discriminate against the farmer and ranchman?

Mr. BLACK and his followers in the Texas delegation have contended that we could not place a duty upon a farm product without granting a compensatory duty to the manufacturer. We have clearly demonstrated to them that they are wrong,

for by a substantial majority we have passed amendments placing a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem upon hides, and a reasonable duty upon cotton; and likewise by a substantial majority we have defeated the amendments proposing a compensatory duty on boots, shoes, and cotton goods.

Our Democratic friends who are against the farmers' products can no longer contend that compensatory duties are necessary, or that they follow as a sequence. And if upon the final record vote to be taken on hides and cotton they should be placed back upon the free list, it will be the result of just such speeches as our colleagues from Texas—Mr. BLACK, Mr. HARDY, Mr. RAYBURN, and others—have made during the past few days, which will be used as an excuse by our Republican brothers, whose leaders have very little use and consideration for the man behind the plow. We forced them to do justice to the farmer and ranchman, and now you are trying to give them an excuse to place cotton and hides back on the free list. And if this is done the farmers and ranchmen in Texas are going to hold you responsible.

As I have said before, let me again repeat that it does not require an expert to realize just how much the above free competitive imports have discriminated against our farmers and stockmen, and their consequent losses thus occasioned, besides the great loss in revenue to the Government.

We have in the United States about 75,000,000 to 80,000,000 head of cattle and we annually raise here less than 30,000,000 head of calves, while South American countries, with only a little more than a third of our population, now have on hand from 80,000,000 to 85,000,000 head of cattle and annually raise approximately 35,000,000 head of calves.

Due to their tropical climate, cheap and luxuriant grass, cheap labor, ample water, and little feeding, our cost of production is about five times as great as theirs per pound.

The time has come when we must take products of American farms and ranches, and all competitive substitutes, off of the free list and let our American market afford a living wage and return to our producers, and when we must so arrange our tariff schedules on such products and substitutes as will equalize our cost of production with that of foreign countries.

The millions of city consumers who inhabit New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Washington, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, and our other large cities, while demanding and getting their \$6, \$8, \$10, \$15, \$20, and \$25 for six to eight hours' work each day, are constantly demanding that everything they eat and wear be furnished to them at the lowest minimum. They never give a serious thought to the subject of a living wage to the producer who feeds and clothes them. And I am afraid that it has been the clamoring of these millions of city consumers, whose votes are very much desired, which has caused some Democratic leaders to disregard the rights of our producers. Much too long have we Democrats permitted rest-needing politicians to entwine into our platforms and policies some city-vote-catching slogan to the detriment of our producers. With blinking eyes we Democrats have sat by and let our brother Republicans pass their measures to place a duty upon pearl buttons, chemical glass, surgical instruments, tungsten, magnesite, and the numerous other products their rich millionaire friends are interested in, thus placing unneeded millions into the pockets of a few wealthy millionaires, and we have let our worthy producers appeal to us in vain.

The proper solution of this question more vitally concerns the consuming millions in cities than anyone else. Suppose our producers were to get tired and quit. There would be starvation in cities. When the manufacturer can not make a profit he shuts down and prevents loss. But after the producer prepares and plants his ground in the spring and arranges for the season's growth of his flocks and herds there is no shutting down for him without losing his whole year's income. He must combat drought, floods, disease, grasshoppers, boll weevil, rust, depredations, plots of gamblers, and the score of other enemies that seem to combine for his destruction. Just now there is ample demand for our products abroad, but want of funds and credit prevents a sale. At an enormous expense we have built a large merchant marine, so essential in bringing the markets of the world to our producers, and we must not let it stand for naught or slip out of our hands. We must find a safe way to assist worthy purchasers to obtain necessary credit. We must see to it that our producers are not forced off of their farms and ranches.

The price our farmer receives for all of his products is the market price of same in the town or city near his farm where he is forced to sell. Will any sensible statesman contend that when hundreds of millions of pounds of farm products are permitted to be imported from foreign countries absolutely free and dumped into the markets of the United States, where when



sold at a profit they are sold at prices far less than the cost of production in this country, they do not affect and lower the price of every product of every farm in the United States?

Ask our farmers what they are getting for their cotton. You will find that they can not sell it for what they have paid out to have it picked and ginned. Ask them if they want us to permit this 345,314,126 pounds of foreign cotton to be imported into the United States absolutely free of duty to compete with their products. Ask our sheep and mohair men, whose wool has gone down from 72 to 15 cents per pound, if they want us to continue to permit 427,578,038 pounds of foreign wool to be imported into the United States each year absolutely free of duty, and for us to continue to permit 64,623,776 pounds of foreign mutton and lamb to be imported here in four months duty free, as was done in July, August, September, and October, 1920.

Time has proven that free raw material is not a fundamental of true Democracy. It has been a fatal policy and constitutes one of our gravest mistakes. It has almost bankrupted some of our southern producers who by law have been forced to purchase everything they have to buy in a protected market and then sell all of their raised products in a free one, where the whole world, dissimilar as it is, competes on an equal footing.

In Mexico, South America, Australia, Europe, Asia, and Africa there exists an entirely different state of conditions, a different standard of living, a different standard of working hours, a different standard of wages, a different standard of necessities, morals, intelligence, hopes, ambitions, and aspirations. Mexican peons are content to work for a miserable existence. Chinese and Japanese laborers are perfectly satisfied to work from 10 to 14 hours each day for less than 20 cents pay, to live on rice, to go almost naked, and to let the future take care of itself. Must our intelligent, ambitious, deserving men and women on the farms and ranches of the United States be longer placed on the same level by being forced to compete directly with the peons and slaves of the universe? I am one loyal Democrat who is not in favor of it.

I want to say that I back my colleague from Texas, JOHN GARNER, in every word that he said on this floor this morning. His policy then enunciated is one that is sound, and that policy is one that I am behind, and I am still a Democrat. [Applause.] It is all foolishness to talk about placing this \$500,000,000 incidental protection on all finished manufactured products and in doing so remain a Democrat, and yet to say that because you have placed some of these \$500,000,000 of duties on the products of the farm and ranch you cease to be a Democrat and are something else. [Applause.]

I did not want that kind of a contention to appear here in the Record without somebody rising and speaking against it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment on page 14, line 13, where the word "determination" is misspelled.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment to correct the spelling of the word "determination." The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LONGWORTH: Page 14, line 13, spell correctly the word "determination."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I shall be compelled under the circumstances to make the point of order that these last two speeches were not addressed to the amendment. I am not disposed to delay the gentleman if he desires to speak five minutes.

Mr. BLACK. That is all.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But otherwise I shall have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, just as I came into the Chamber a moment ago my good friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] was speaking on the effect of the incidental protection afforded to some of these different products included in amendments which he has supported. I noticed in one of the Texas newspapers which came to my desk a few days ago a dispatch under prominent headlines, "BLANTON denounces the Fordney tariff bill as pernicious and indefensible."

Mr. BLANTON. And I do yet.

Mr. BLACK. Let me finish. But the trouble with the gentleman's denunciation is that it does not seem to follow any definite line of policy.

Now, what is the situation? I can imagine the Clerk of the House calling the roll on the different items in this bill, and on the different items I hear my distinguished colleague answer both "absent" and "present." For example, I hear the Clerk call the roll on dyestuffs. The gentleman from Texas answers "No; an indefensible outrage upon the people!" I hear the Clerk call the roll on steel, and iron, and aluminum, and nickel, and other metal products, and my colleague from Texas answers, "No; just another effort to protect the trusts at the expense of the people." Then I hear the Clerk call the roll on hides, and my colleague from Texas answers, "Yes; now you are talking!" [Laughter.] "I am with you strong upon that schedule." Then I hear the Clerk of the House again calling the roll, and he calls out pottery, and glassware, and spectacles, and eyeglasses, and optical glasses, and my colleague answers, "No; I am for a tariff for revenue only, and these schedules violate that doctrine." Then I hear the Clerk call the roll on hats, and bonnets, and lace, and embroidery, gunwads, and spunk, and my colleague from Texas answers, "No; I am against 'em. The rates are entirely too high."

Then I hear the Clerk of the House call out "oil," and my colleague from Texas says, "Yes; a thousand times yes. This infant industry only produces about 400,000,000 barrels of oil a year, or 70 per cent of the world's production, and needs protection badly." [Laughter.] Why, gentlemen, the situation is simply this: This good ship *Fordney Bill* is about to sail for a protective-tariff harbor port. [Applause.] Her old, tattered sails are already fluttering in the wind. My good friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is not willing to get on board the ship. He knows that she is a leaky old boat, but he has got some babies that he wants to put on board. So we have witnessed him enthusiastically taking those babies and putting them on the old boat, and to-day when the whistle blows for all hands to get on deck, the ship is about to depart, I see my good friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] rushing down the gangplank so that he can get safely back on shore; but he says, "I will leave my babies on board." [Laughter.] And then I see him going back home next summer to his constituents and saying, "I helped get a duty on hides and cotton and I spoke eloquently and persuasively for a duty on oil." But he will not forget that there are still some Democrats who hold to the good old-time doctrine of the party and have not been seduced by the protective propaganda of the Southern Tariff League, and so he will turn to these Democrats and say, "But I will tell you what I did do. Although I helped to get these babies on board, I did all I could to submarine that old ship after I got them on." [Laughter.] I fired the strongest torpedo at her that I possibly could when I voted against the bill on the final vote, and if the votes had all been like mine that old vessel would have gone down beneath the waves with my babies on board." [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. LONGWORTH: Page 27, lines 1 and 2, strike out paragraph 48, in lines 1 and 2, and insert: "PAR. 48. Menthol, 25 per cent ad valorem. Camphor, crude, natural, 1 cent per pound. Camphor, refined or synthetic, 6 cents per pound."

Mr. OLDFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Does the gentleman's amendment increase these duties or decrease them?

Mr. LONGWORTH. It very greatly decreases them. I will explain to the gentleman the reason in a word. These duties are the same as in the Payne law and essentially the same as in the Underwood law. The Payne law imposed a duty of 1 cent on crude and 6 cents on the refined, and the Underwood law let the crude come in free and imposed 5 cents on the refined. The reason we put on a 25 per cent duty was to encourage, if possible, the synthetic camphor industry in this country. The trouble about the present situation is that Japan has an absolute monopoly on crude camphor. It is a world monopoly, and Japan charges what it pleases and furnishes any amount it pleases.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Does the gentleman know what the price is now per pound?

Mr. LONGWORTH. It varies very greatly. I think it is 45 cents a pound now, so that a duty of 25 per cent would be about 10 or 11 cents a pound; but there does not seem to be

much prospect of developing the manufacture of synthetic camphor, and there was very great objection by the manufacturers of articles in which camphor is used as a raw material, and the committee after consideration thought this was the better rate.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. LONGWORTH: Page 181, line 7, after the word "rates," insert a comma and the words "but this provision shall not apply to articles on the free list."

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois called attention to this provision the other day, which states that if perchance an article carries two rates of duty in different portions of the bill, the higher rate shall be construed as the rate to be collected. It does not provide as to cases where an article may be mentioned twice in the bill, once on the free list. Generally the courts have construed that where an article in a tariff bill is mentioned on the free list and also on the dutiable list the free-list provision governs. However, the decisions are not so uniform as to make it an absolutely settled case. In my judgment, where an article is specifically placed on the free list, if by any chance it is mentioned in the dutiable list, nevertheless it should remain free, and that is the object of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report:

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment by Mr. TILSON: Page 88, line 22, after the word "woods," insert a comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. I do this for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee—and I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means on this proposition—to the fact that subsection (J) of the Underwood tariff bill provided that a discount of 5 per cent on all duties imposed in that act should be allowed on such goods, wares, and merchandise as should be imported in vessels submitting to American registration.

Mr. FORDNEY. The courts declared that that was unconstitutional.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Underwood law provided further that nothing in that subsection should be construed as abrogating any treaties concluded between the United States and any foreign nation. The gentleman from Michigan states that the Supreme Court of the United States held that that section of the Underwood law was unconstitutional, because it was in conflict with some of our commercial treaties. I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not the committee in considering the general policy of the proposed bill gave any consideration whatever to this question of allowing a discount in the tariff duties on goods imported in American bottoms?

Mr. FORDNEY. No. I think that would be equally unconstitutional, in that I think it would interfere with our favored-nation clauses, because an article might come from one country in an American vessel and have a discount and come from another country in a foreign vessel and not be entitled to it. That would be a discrimination in favor of one country against another, which would be a violation of the favored-nation clause.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to call attention to this fact, because I had it up with the gentleman in private conversation. I do not think the section repealing laws in conflict with provisions of this bill repeals at all the terms of said section in the Underwood Act.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman is correct and will point out the error we will try to have it corrected in the Senate, but I do not think we can do it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 84, lines 12, 13, and 14: In line 12 strike out the comma and insert in lieu thereof a period. Strike out the balance of line 12, all of lines 13 and 14, down to and including the word "law."

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes out an administrative provision of the lead paragraph. These provisions have been found obsolete and useless, and the Tariff Commission has recommended that they be eliminated.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but as I want to speak on another schedule I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks that he may proceed out of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do the gentleman's remarks pertain to the tariff?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Oh, yes; but on another schedule.

Mr. Chairman, several gentlemen have appealed to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and to Members on this side of the House to grant us an opportunity to vote upon the potash schedule. Up to this time they have not succeeded, and I now take it for granted that no such permission will be given. I doubt if gentlemen on the committee appreciate the effect of that schedule. Before the war potash was laid down in this country for \$75 or \$80 a ton. In 1920 the price of Alsatian potash in this country was \$150 a ton. On July 18, 1921, it was selling for \$90 a ton. You think you are going to protect the producers of domestic potash by levying a duty of \$50 a ton, but you readily see that you will not do so because Alsatian potash can be laid down here for \$140 a ton. Potash producers in this country tell us that it costs \$204 a ton to produce it, and when they have produced it they have to ship it 2,000 miles across the continent in order to get a market, for most of the potash is used on the Atlantic seaboard. Therefore you will not enable them to compete. There is another angle to this question.

Unfortunately, the potash that was sold on the Atlantic seaboard in 1919 had so much borax in it that it destroyed the crops, and the American farmer became prejudiced against it. The producers have remedied this, but it will be a long time before the farmers will get over their prejudices. When it costs \$204 to produce potash and they have to ship it across the continent, how can they compete with potash laid down here at \$90 a ton and your tax of \$50, making it \$140 a ton? Manifestly they could not do it.

Now, you may argue that it will produce revenue. Last year we imported 220,000 tons, but we imported it because of the abnormal price of all farm products. Sixty per cent of the potash is used for tobacco and cotton and 40 per cent is used by the truck farmers. The truckers say they can not use potash in normal times if it costs more than \$100 a ton. They say if they do not use potash they can not grow vegetables that they can ship. Grown without potash, vegetables quickly deteriorate and will not stand shipment. They can not ship their tomatoes, onions, and other vegetables essential to the welfare of the people. You desire to help the potash producers by forcing the farmers to purchase their product, but you can not do it. What you will do is to force the truckers out of business. That will result in decreasing the supply of potatoes and other vegetables, resulting in an increased price for these necessities of life. I appeal to my good friend to let the House vote on this schedule. The Underwood bill had potash on the free list. Every other bill has. This is a burden to the city man as well as the country man.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, while the potash question has been under discussion I have been wanting to get into the RECORD some information as to whether or not the alunite of the country has any prospect of being developed. Alunite is a sulphate of potash, but it is insoluble. Before the war began a delegation of Holland chemists were over here who were going to undertake the development of alunite, which is to be found in unlimited quantities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I think I have answered the gentleman's question. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 168, line 1, after the comma and before the numerals "10" insert the words "not specially provided for."

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.



Mr. KING. I see that the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut has a number of amendments in his hand. I would ask him whether or not he has an amendment there to reduce the tariff on blackstrap molasses.

Mr. TILSON. I am not in charge of that amendment.

Mr. KING. What position has the committee taken upon that?

Mr. TILSON. The committee has acted and will in due time make its report.

Mr. KING. Have they acted against the bringing in of an amendment or for the bringing in of an amendment?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the committee acted in favor of bringing in an amendment changing the figure 1 cent to three-quarters of a cent.

Mr. KING. Will that be acted upon before we take the vote?

Mr. FORDNEY. As soon as the gentleman from Connecticut gets through with his amendments I shall offer that amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, is this amendment agreeable to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON]?

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is made necessary by the action taken by the committee upon the insistence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. There is conflict in the bill unless these words are inserted.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not rise at this time to discuss the bill, but to express my gratification at the fact that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] promises us that while we have not been particularly enlightened as to the attitude of his side in respect to the bill up to this time, we may expect to be in the future by some remarks which he proposes to place in the RECORD. I hope that in his remarks the gentleman will call attention to the attitude of the gentleman from Tennessee and others upon the Democratic side that has tended to prevent the reading of the bill and the offering of amendments.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I shall not do that, because it is not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, the gentleman's memory is conveniently short. I remember very well the occasion when the gentleman from Tennessee in his impetuosity would not allow a paragraph to be completely read in order that an amendment might be offered, but insisted on stopping the reading in the midst of the paragraph, when gentlemen on the Republican side were prepared to offer amendments to it, in order that he, the gentleman from Tennessee, might offer an extraneous amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield further.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I shall point out the hours of the day at which the majority force adjournment in order to prevent a reading of the bill for amendment under the general rules of the House and various things along that line. It will be a very interesting statement, I assure the gentleman. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman might add, if he were so disposed, which he may not be, that the minority were very happy on each and every occasion when the majority, late in the afternoon after a long day's work, did force an adjournment. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The policy of the gentleman works like the darky's con trap; it is intended to catch them going and coming. The members of the minority were perfectly willing to adjourn, were in fact anxious to do so, and perfectly willing to appear to protest against it.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said, I do not intend to submit at this time any remarks on this bill. I arose to call attention to the fact that with the passage of the Fordney tariff bill the House will have completed its labors on the more important of the two great problems which we were called upon to settle at this special session, one of the tariff and one of taxation. While the Committee on Ways and Means has labored earnestly, worked diligently for long hours during the entire session and particularly during the days of the debate, it is the purpose of that committee to begin consideration immediately of a tax measure, and I am confident that it will be presented to the House at no distant date.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit me to add at that point that the majority members of the committee asked the chairman to give notice through the press, and yesterday evening notice was given to the press, that hearings on a revision of the

internal-revenue law will begin on Tuesday morning next at 10 o'clock; that is, for four days.

Mr. MONDELL. That is to be taken up on Tuesday.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I regret I can not yield.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I wanted to ask a question which I think the gentleman from Michigan ought to tell us.

Mr. MONDELL. Very well.

Mr. OLDFIELD. The gentleman from Michigan said something about the majority members meeting in regard to hearings on the internal revenue on next Tuesday. Is it going to be the policy of the gentleman to keep the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means from those hearings?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no, sir; we are going to ask you to come right in and hear all that is said.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I wanted to get that in the RECORD. The gentleman did not say that a while ago.

Mr. MONDELL. I express the hope that the committee will not find it necessary to continue those hearings for any considerable length of time. I have such faith in the members of the committee, I have such confidence in the information they already possess as to the questions and problems before them, that I hope and trust that they will not consider it necessary to continue the hearings for any considerable length of time, in which event I am sure we will have a bill before us promptly. Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, in view of the fact that we will conclude to-day the consideration of this measure, that it is a very proper time to put in the RECORD a statement of the bills which have been passed and measures which have been considered by this Congress.

The Sixty-seventh Congress was called in extraordinary session by the President on April 11, 1921, primarily for the purpose of considering questions of tariff and taxation.

With the passage of the Fordney tariff bill the House will have completed the consideration of the larger and more difficult of the two major problems presented for consideration this session.

We can not say just how soon the Committee on Ways and Means can prepare and present, and the House pass, a measure revising the tax laws, as I have said, but the Committee on Ways and Means, notwithstanding the strain and pressure they have been under in the preparation and passage of the tariff bill, will proceed at once to the consideration of tax problems. The questions involved, while tremendously important, are not as numerous as those met in the tariff measure, and we may, I believe, confidently expect that this great and important task will be disposed of at a comparatively early date.

Heretofore it has been almost the universal practice of the Congress to stand in recess, or at least to mark time, while a tariff bill was being prepared. Not so this Congress. Its committees set to work at once. They have worked diligently. The House has been in almost continuous session and it has passed more important legislation than has ever been enacted or considered in the same time under similar circumstances.

Forty-eight bills have passed both Houses and become laws. That is a bill every two days since the Congress has been in session. It does not include bills in conference or 21 important bills that have passed the House, not including private or pension bills. Among the bills that have become laws are such important measures as—

The emergency tariff on agricultural products.

The immigration restriction bill.

The bill providing for a budget system.

The peace resolution.

The naval appropriation bill, on which was saved \$86,000,000 below the sum carried by the same bill in the closing days of the last Congress.

The Army appropriation bill, which reduced the Army to 150,000 men and reduced the appropriation \$15,000,000 below what the bill carried when pocket vetoed by President Wilson because it was too low.

The bill making provision for an additional Treasury deposit of \$25,000,000 for the Farm Loan Board.

The bill to facilitate the organization of corporations to promote export trade.

The bill providing for a much-needed consolidation of independent telephone companies.

The bill to provide machinery for the authorized landing of submarine cables.

And many others set out in the following list:

Bills that have passed both Houses and are now in conference or in a condition to go to conference are the so-called packers' bill and the bill extending the Federal road act so as to give the public-land States additional credits and allowances under Federal road appropriations, and to provide for the mainte-

nance of highways. Also the Sweet bill establishing a veterans' bureau and consolidating all of the agencies caring for ex-service men.

Among the 21 important bills that have passed the House are—

The Fordney tariff bill.

A bill providing for a revision of the laws, the first since 1878.

The Volstead antibeer bill.

A bill to prevent gambling in grain futures.

A bill relieving associations of producers of agricultural products from prosecution under the antitrust laws.

A bill allowing the widows of soldiers and sailors to have credit for their husband's military service on homestead entries.

And a number of other measures referred to by title in the following list, not including private bills or pension bills:

LIST OF HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS THAT HAVE BECOME LAWS; SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SIXTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS.

H. R. 2435.—Providing temporary duties on agricultural products, with antidumping provision.

H. R. 4075.—Limitation and restriction of immigration.

S. 1084.—Providing a budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts.

S. J. Res. 16.—Repealing resolution declaring state of war, and establishing a condition of peace.

H. R. 4803.—Naval appropriation bill, containing disarmament provision.

H. R. 5010.—Army appropriation bill reducing Army to 150,000 men.

S. 1837.—Authorizing Secretary of Treasury to make deposits, not to exceed twenty-five millions, for use of Federal land banks on request of Federal Farm Loan Board.

S. 86.—Amending Federal reserve act to facilitate organization of corporations in export trade.

H. R. 6567.—Authorizing consolidation of independent telephone companies.

S. 535.—To prevent unauthorized landing of submarine cables.

H. R. 6573.—Reclassifying and readjusting compensation of employees in Postal Service.

H. R. 6300.—Deficiency appropriation bill, first for 1921.

H. R. 3707.—Appropriation for expenses incident to first session Sixty-seventh Congress.

H. R. 5756.—Limiting indebtedness of government of Philippine Islands.

H. R. 4586.—Providing punishment for handling personal property on contract of sale with intent to defraud.

S. 594.—Relief to ex-service men for defeated rights of entry on North Platte irrigation project.

S. 1019.—Providing transportation for destitute discharged soldiers and sailors in Europe.

S. J. Res. 30.—Authorizing President to appoint member of Committee on Reorganization.

S. 1881.—Defining act creating Hawaiian homes commission.

H. R. 2499.—Providing for acquisition by United States of fishing rights in Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.

H. J. Res. 148.—Relief of Colorado flood sufferers.

H. R. 2428.—Granting lands to Converse County, Wyo., for park purposes.

H. J. Res. 52.—Authorizing Secretary of Interior to furnish water to entrymen in arrears on public lands.

H. R. 5223.—Exempting from cancellation certain desert-land entries in California.

H. R. 5622.—Appraisal and sale of Vashon Island Military Reservation.

H. R. 2422.—Relief of settlers and entrymen on Baca Float No. 3, Arizona.

H. R. 2466.—Making Fort Worth, Tex., port of entry.

H. R. 2421.—Granting lands to Phoenix, Ariz., for municipal purposes.

H. J. Res. 82.—Ratifying establishment of boundary line between the States of Pennsylvania and Delaware.

H. R. 2185.—Cancellation stamp, pageant of progress exposition, for use in Chicago post office.

H. R. 3018.—Authorizing dike across Mud Slough on Isthmus Inlet, Ore.

And other bills relating to dams, bridges, and so forth.

In all 48 public laws have been placed on the statute books this session, up to July 15.

HOUSE BILLS THAT HAVE PASSED HOUSE AND SENATE AND ARE NOW IN CONFERENCE.

H. R. 6320.—Packers' bill, to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in live stock and dairy products, poultry, and eggs.

H. R. 6611.—Sweet bill, establishing veterans' bureau in Treasury, and consolidating Bureau of War Risk and other activities on behalf of ex-service men.

SENATE BILLS WHICH HAVE PASSED THE HOUSE BUT ARE NOT IN CONFERENCE

S. 1072.—Amending act providing for Federal aid in construction of rural post roads.

LIST OF THE MORE IMPORTANT BILLS THAT HAVE PASSED THE HOUSE.

H. R. 7456.—Fordney tariff bill, providing revenue, regulating commerce with foreign countries, and encouraging industries of the United States.

H. R. 12.—Revision of the laws; first since 1878.

H. R. 7294.—Supplementing and defining national prohibition act.

H. R. 5676.—Regulation of boards of trade, and taxing contracts for the sale of grain for future delivery, and options on same.

H. R. 6754.—Regulations for promoting the welfare of American seamen in merchant marine on vessels on the Great Lakes.

H. J. Res. 153.—Permitting admission of certain aliens who sailed from foreign ports on or before June 8, 1921.

H. R. 4810.—Authorizing incorporation of companies to promote trade with China.

H. R. 4981.—Preventing manufacture of adulterated or misbranded foods and drugs.

H. R. 2373.—To authorize associations of producers of agricultural products.

H. R. 70.—Allowing credit to widows of soldiers and sailors in making homestead entries for their husbands' military service.

H. R. 7158.—Appropriation for completion of the acquisition of real estate for the Military Establishment.

H. J. Res. 31.—Directing Treasury to allow credit to disbursing clerk, Bureau of War Risk.

H. R. 6877.—Providing for agreement among seven Western States for the disposition and apportionment of waters of Colorado River.

H. R. 2376.—Competency of witnesses to testify in criminal actions.

H. R. 5585.—Permitting execution of pension papers in foreign countries.

H. J. Res. 7.—Authorizing Secretary of Navy to open radio stations for use of public.

H. R. 5013.—Authorizing Secretary of Navy to sanction certain titles on memorials.

H. R. 6673.—Granting franchise for gas and electricity for certain districts of Hawaii.

H. J. Res. 138.—Repealing portion of act providing for sale of Camp Eustis.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the motion made by the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill is to be passed soon by the House, and my purpose in rising at this time is to congratulate the Members on both sides of the House for the profound consideration which they have been able to give to this bill during its consideration in the committee and the number of amendments they have been permitted to offer and have adopted. I have hurriedly glanced through the measure during its spasmodic consideration as intelligently as I could, and I have not the slightest doubt that if the rank and file of the membership of this House had had a voice in its consideration and had been permitted to offer amendments in good faith, and to improve the bill by striking out some of its iniquities, there would have been many changes made in this bill since introduced by the Committee on Ways and Means; but by the rule which you adopted here in the beginning in great hilarity you have hog-tied yourselves, you have tongue-tied yourselves, you have bound and handcuffed yourselves until you can not move, and none of you have had any voice in framing this measure. Yesterday the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. LAYTON] excited my profound sympathy by his appeal, the almost helpless appeal, which he made to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to permit him to offer an amendment. He prayed for the gracious privilege of simply rising and offering an amendment. But the Ways and Means Committee was adamant. He could not offer the amendment which his people wanted. He had handcuffed himself when he voted for the special rule.

Mr. LAYTON. Let me say I have gotten over it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wonder what salve they administered to the gentleman. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] He complained yesterday that they were putting upon the dutiable list an article 99 per cent of which was used by the manufacturers in his district, and bewailed and appealed and almost supplicated the gentleman from Michigan to allow him to offer an amendment, and when he found he could not offer the amend-



ment to protect his own constituency he took his seat meekly and submitted to the steam roller. His humiliating situation only illustrated and emphasized the helpless condition of every other Member of this House during the whole consideration of this measure. Not one Member among the 435 Members of this House has been allowed to do so much as arise in his place and offer any sort of amendment to this bill, except a few favored members of the committee, who have themselves discovered over 300 mistakes in the bill since it was introduced three weeks ago.

You have placed in this bill a provision to the effect that those traveling abroad and returning to the United States may bring in here \$250 worth of wearing apparel or furniture or any other article free of duty, and yet if a man is unable to go abroad and must stay at home and work, but desires to buy something that is made in some other country, he must pay a duty of from 10 to 1,300 per cent on the various articles in this bill. How many of you would favor such a proposal if you were allowed to amend it?

You have all abrogated your authority to the Ways and Means Committee. Nine men of this House have dictated what kind of a tariff measure we are to be permitted to vote on in a few hours. And assuming—erroneously, I think—that the Ways and Means Committee is all-powerful and all-wise, you have tied yourselves up by your own consent so that you can not register your own will nor the will of those who sent you here. Day before yesterday you adopted an amendment offered by a member of the Ways and Means Committee putting hides on the dutiable list. Everybody thought that applied only to hides of cattle, but yesterday the Ways and Means Committee awoke from its slumbers and discovered that a great blunder had been made, and not only hides of cattle but all sorts of skins of every description, character, and size had been placed upon the dutiable list, and now you must go through the performance in some way of extricating this wise Ways and Means Committee from the effect of the deed they permitted to be imposed upon the House while they were asleep.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is already taken care of by an amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is only another evidence of the utter folly of the House in abdication and surrendering its constitutional power and responsibility in a matter of such grave importance and tied itself in such a way that even meritorious amendments could not be offered by Members of either side of the House.

When this bill gets into the Senate they will discuss it for months. They will deliberate upon it. Why have they more right to deliberate indefinitely on a measure of this importance than Members of the House to deliberate for a reasonable time? You new Members will have to go out next year and defend this bill upon every stump. I rejoice that I shall have no such burden resting upon me. You will have to defend your vote for it; and yet if you tell your constituents the truth you will tell them that while you swallowed it whole you were not permitted to offer a single amendment to it that might affect their districts and welfare; that you had to defend something of which you knew nothing, and that you do not even now understand its provisions and have not been able to read it and upon it you have not been able to engraft one slight amendment.

Mr. FORDNEY. On the other hand, my beloved friend, the bill will defend these men.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the bill is as helpless in defending them as they have been in understanding it or in changing it or in even considering it since it has been under consideration here, it will have a hard time making itself articulate in their defense. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. TILSON: Page 172, line 5, strike out the numerals "15" and insert "20."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman explain that amendment?

Mr. TILSON. This is an amendment to increase the rate on glove leather from 15 to 20 per cent. Glove leather seems to catch it in this bill going and coming, especially since the

amendment of the other day putting hides and skins on the dutiable list was adopted. The wool on the skins must pay a duty and the skins as well, so that this industry will find itself badly handicapped. Therefore, in the judgment of the committee, it needs this additional 5 per cent duty.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If by a vote of the House the duty should be taken off hides and hides put on the free list, will we then have a separate vote on this?

Mr. TILSON. I think that even with hides on the free list, as they should be, in my judgment, nevertheless this increase should be granted to the glove leather.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we passed an amendment that the highest rate of duty that shall apply shall not apply to articles on the free list, so that skins, being on the free list, remain on the free list.

Mr. TILSON. This may relieve the situation as to skins but not as to other matters.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I did not catch the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. TILSON. The amendment is to raise the rate from 15 per cent ad valorem to 20 per cent ad valorem on glove leather.

Mr. COLLIER. A compensatory rate?

Mr. TILSON. It is not a compensatory duty.

Mr. COLLIER. It was one of the rates referred to that has been so continually raised during the discussion on this bill.

Mr. TILSON. It is a rate that, after careful examination, the committee has thought best to increase to this extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 65, noes 44.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut offers a further amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. TILSON: Page 176, line 20, strike out "15 per cent ad valorem" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "6 cents per gross; leads not exceeding six one-thousandths of an inch in diameter and commonly known as refills, 10 cents per gross; colored, copy, or indelible leads, 60 cents per gross; and in addition thereto, with all the foregoing, 20 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. COLLIER. How much does this increase the rate?

Mr. TILSON. The rate carried in the bill is 15 per cent ad valorem. This amendment increases it by the slight specific duty of 6 cents per gross. The subcommittee having this paragraph in charge, Mr. Chairman, considered this matter with what they realized at the time was insufficient information and somewhat hesitatingly came to the conclusion carried in the bill, but could not do otherwise with the information at hand. Since that time we have been furnished with additional information concerning this industry, especially its development and growth since the war began. It is largely a southern industry. The raw material is graphite. In this bill we have placed a tax on graphite. We have also placed a duty on pencils and everything else that is made from this intermediate lead, and have left the pencil lead itself at a very low rate. We believe that this amendment equalizes the duty and makes it fair to the man who makes the pencil lead as it is to the graphite producer and the pencil manufacturer.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Does the gentleman's amendment take care of the colored lead that is not inclosed in wood?

Mr. TILSON. Yes. It takes care of that.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. All I have to say as to this particular amendment is that it is along the same line as a great many other increases that will make this bill so much higher than it was when it was originally presented; that this not only puts a specific tax here on the pencils that was not there before, but it increases the ad valorem 5 per cent. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut offers another committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. TILSON: Page 82, line 22, strike out the numeral "7" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "35."

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases very materially the duty on quicksilver. After long deliberation the committee, with a sharp division in its ranks, adopted the paragraph as it appears in the bill. Since the bill was printed the committee has received a letter from the Secretary of War which is so strong that the committee does not feel justified in disregarding his statement as to the existing situation or his recommendation as to what should be done under the circumstances. I now ask unanimous consent to have read from the Clerk's desk such portions of this letter as are not marked "confidential." Of course, any Member of the House may read the entire letter. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the letter referred to be read from the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(Confidential.)

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, July 15, 1921.

Hon. JOHN Q. TILSON,  
Ways and Means Committee,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN:

Quicksilver (mercury) is an essential component in the manufacture of munitions, being used, so far as the military service is concerned, in the manufacture of mercury fulminate for use as a detonator of high explosives, in the manufacture of certain drugs and chemicals, and in certain electrical equipment.

A study of the past record of the industry indicates that it is capable of meeting the normal demands of the country in peace, and in a war involving the maximum effort, however, the steady reduction in the number of producing mines indicates that it will be but a short time before the normal peace demands of the country will have to be made from outside sources of supply. The normal peace demand is approximately 24,000 flasks, and the productions in 1920 show but 13,070 flasks. This decreasing production is due to a decline in prices consequent upon a decreasing demand for the home product due to the prevailing high cost of labor and supplies, the present demand being now met from surplus stocks accumulated during the war and from imports.

The number of producing mines has steadily decreased from 51 in 1917 to 14 in 1920. This decline in productivity has been due to the conditions indicated above and also to the importations from Europe, particularly Spain and Italy, where, due to cheaper and cruder refining methods, the cost per flask is below the cost of production in the United States.

The result of the above is that while there are sufficient mines and refineries in the United States capable of producing sufficient quicksilver to meet our needs in peace and war, the inability to work them, due to lack of profit in production, actually results, as a matter of fact, in a reduction in the resources of the Nation in this commodity for war purposes, in that this shutting down of the mines results in a corresponding deterioration of plant equipment and mine installation, and the longer such unproductiveness continues the greater does the menace to our war production increase, due to the increased time necessary to bring the mines back to a condition of productivity.

The War Department is of the opinion that in order that the needs of the country in war may be met from the resources available in the United States, governmental protection of the quicksilver industry in time of peace is essential, and it is, therefore, recommended that such a tariff be placed upon imports as may be considered necessary by the Congress to enable this industry to be operated on a profitable basis in time of peace in order that it may be maintained in a condition to meet the needs of the country in time of war.

Sincerely, yours,

JOHN W. WEEKS,  
Secretary of War.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I have one more amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. TILSON: Page 85, line 4, strike out "one-fourth" and insert in lieu thereof "one-half"; in line 6 strike out "one-half of"; in line 8 strike out "one" and insert in lieu thereof "one and one-half"; on page 86, line 1, after the word "paragraph," strike out the colon and insert in lieu thereof a period; and beginning with the word "Provided," strike out the balance of the paragraph, including the last two words in line 1 and all of lines 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. COLLIER rose.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. TILSON. In view of the very short time, I would like to see if we can agree to have 10 minutes' debate on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate—

Mr. COLLIER. Make it 12 minutes. I want two. Give the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] five and the gentleman can take five.

Mr. TILSON. I want a little time to be considered in this.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the request and take the floor in my own right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, this is the zinc paragraph. This amendment strikes out the proviso in the paragraph and makes the rates now carried in the proviso the permanent rates. The bill as it stands carries certain permanent rates and then in the proviso provides that these permanent rates shall not be in effect until two years from the day following the passage of this act. In other words, we provide in the bill for certain rates to last two years, when the lower permanent rates go into effect. The amendment simply makes permanent the rates that under the bill as it stands would be in effect during the next two years.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. COLLIER. It not only makes them permanent, but increases them, does it not?

Mr. TILSON. It does not increase the rates now carried in the proviso.

Mr. COLLIER. How about the rates in the other part of the paragraph?

Mr. TILSON. It is intended only to make permanent the rates carried in the proviso for the next two years.

Mr. COLLIER. It is from 25 to 50 per cent more than the rates in this bill.

Mr. TILSON. I repeat that the rates carried in the proviso, which are to be in effect during the next two years, are by this amendment made the permanent rates.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that this amendment will increase the rates on all the zinc ore from 25 to 50 per cent over what is carried in the bill, and that is in line with the general policy.

Now, if I may be permitted, I would like to give the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield for just one minute?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut moves that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in four minutes. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, you have been so kind to me at all times that I do not feel I should impose on the time of the House at the present moment; but in consideration of your great friendliness to me I feel I should impart to you some information which came to me in a telegram just a few minutes ago. The message is signed by about 40 of the largest houses in Chicago, nearly every one of which I venture to say is Republican, and I believe you ought to know what they have to say of the bill for which you are about to vote. The telegram reads as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., July 21, 1921.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Under American valuation plan, which forms the basis of the Fordney tariff bill (H. R. 7456), merchants can not determine the cost of imported merchandise prior to its actual arrival and clearance through the customhouse. Goods can not be sold in advance of delivery without knowledge of costs. Purchases abroad would practically cease with consequent loss of revenue to Government. The rates provided in the bill when applied under the American valuation clause unwarrantably increase cost, which the consumer must bear. While we all believe in a fair measure of protection to American industries, this bill is designed solely in the interest of the domestic producer who fixes the amount of duties his competitor is obliged to pay. It gives him absolute control of the market, enabling him to advance prices without reasonable and unwarranted when viewed in the light of our rapidly declining imports. The reduction in our purchasing abroad is seriously affecting our international trade. Shipment of our surplus products to foreign countries is rapidly declining. The American valuation, if enacted into law, will go far to destroy our foreign trade, for if we do not buy we can not sell. We believe that in the interest of the general industries of the country and the consuming public this bill should be defeated and urge you as our representative to vote against the measure.

Marshall Field & Co., Carson Pirie Scott & Co., John V. Farwell Co., Chas. A. Stevens & Bro., Mandel Bros., Pitkin & Brooks, Rothschild & Co., The Fair, Hart, Schaffner & Marx, Albert Pick & Co., Gage Bros. & Co., Montgomery Ward & Co., Butler Bros., Sears, Roebuck & Co., Merchants Loan & Trust Co.; by E. D. Bulbert, president Illinois Trust & Savings Bank; by John J. Mitchell, chairman Corn Exchange National



Bank; by Ernest A. Hamill, president National Bank of the Republic; by W. T. Fenton, first vice president Union Trust Co.; by F. H. Rawson, president W. A. Wieboldt & Co.; E. Iverson & Co., E. H. Knoop & Co., Loren Miller & Co., Laboratory Materials Co., Berghoff Importing Co., Illinois Watch Case Co., Boston Store, Lyon & Healy, Irvin Smith Co. (Inc.), Burley & Co., Jacob Williams Jamieson Co., D. B. Fisk & Co., G. W. Sheldon & Co., Peters Van Schaack & Son, A. B. Fielder & Sons, Francis T. Simmons & Co., Tonk Bros. Co., Wm. Lewis & Son, Worms & Loeb, Morris Woolf Silk Co., A. L. Randall Co.

Mr. Chairman, no doubt a majority of the signers of this telegram are known to nearly every Member of this House. They are the most representative business men not only in Chicago but in the United States, and, as stated before, nearly all belong to your party. Therefore I feel you ought to know their views and sentiments, as well as of men in every walk of life from whom I have received hundreds of letters, telegrams, and petitions who protest against this, what they believe, iniquitous bill, which is bound to retard the progress and prosperity of our Nation. Not only that, but it will have a tendency to deprive the American manufacturer from exporting his surpluses and will still further increase unemployment. A majority of you must realize that the bill as drafted places additional burdens upon the consumer; it increases the taxes on the necessities of life, and taxes many necessities which never heretofore have been taxed, and which we ourselves export in large quantities.

Mr. Chairman, it is contended that these taxes will be beneficial to the farmer, but in view of the fact that we export ten times as much wheat and other surpluses as we import I feel that such contention is erroneous. The only thing it will accomplish is an increase in price to the consumer, which will be to the interest of the speculator. It is also charged that the special interests are being taken care of in this bill in the way of a heavy tax being placed on the commodities which they produce, thereby stopping importations and preventing competition, thus giving these interests the power to increase their prices, which the consumer will be obliged to pay.

Mr. Chairman, I ask in all earnestness, would it not be better for the country if instead of passing this bill you would revise the present hastily passed revenue law and repeal many of the objectionable features which are not only annoying but which in a great measure handicaps the business men and manufacturers of our Nation? This you have promised to do, especially as to the excess-profits tax, as to the corporation tax, as to the tax on luxuries, the so-called amusement tax relating to moving pictures, as well as the tax on small incomes. I feel that unless you repeal these war revenue or tax laws, as you have made the country believe you will, you will be held responsible for failure to do so, and which will, no doubt, mean your defeat in the next election, for which you alone will be responsible. The country is clamoring for relief and is entitled to it, and I therefore earnestly hope you will pay heed to this advice. I make this plea because he that serves the Nation best serves the party best.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. COLLIER) there were—ayes 95, noes 45.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. LONGWORTH: Page 32, line 14, strike out the figures "10" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "33."

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it is with some regret that I offer this amendment, because it makes a very high duty on this product, but in view of the amendment increasing the duty on quicksilver it becomes absolutely necessary. Quicksilver forms 85 per cent of vermilion red paint.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, all I have to say along the line of the policy of this amendment is that it increases the rate something over 300 per cent above what is carried in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. LONGWORTH) there were—ayes 63, noes 43.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers a committee amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. LONGWORTH: Page 3, line 14, after the word "wood," strike out the comma and insert in lieu a parenthesis; after the word "methanol," strike out the comma and

insert in lieu a parenthesis. In line 15 strike out the words "and ethyl," and the colon after the word "gallon" and insert in lieu the following: "And ethyl, for nonbeverage purposes only, 15 cents per proof gallon." In line 15, beginning with the word "Provided," strike out the rest of the paragraph.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this will be to reduce the rate of duty on ethyl alcohol not suitable for beverage purposes. The duty should be on the proof gallon, and this corrects the phraseology. Ethyl alcohol has heretofore come in, whether for beverage purposes or not, under the brandy paragraph. This removes that duty and leaves only the internal-revenue tax of \$2.20, which always attaches to any nonpotable alcohol taken out of bond.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment. It is with deep regret that I offer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. FORDNEY: Page 91, line 25, after the comma, insert "three-fourths of."

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the duty on blackstrap molasses from 1 cent to three-fourths of a cent per gallon.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I am glad the gentleman has decided to have it reduced before the Democrats get into power, which will be no longer than the next election, if many provisions like this are adopted.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, I know, you would put it on the free list.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to add a word of personal explanation, although I think the gentlemen on the other side understand it. I informed a number of gentlemen on the other side the other day, or yesterday, I think, that a different amendment from this would be offered. I understood that the committee had approved that amendment; but whether they did or not, they subsequently took different action. As far as I am concerned, I would like to see this duty lowered further.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. McDUFFIE for the committee amendment: Page 91, line 25, strike out the words and figures "1 cent per gallon" after the word "sugars," and insert in lieu thereof the words and figures "0.38 of 1 cent per gallon."

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I have not offered the substitute to the amendment offered by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for the purpose of delaying the passage of this bill or simply to get some of my remarks in the Record. I have offered it because I really believe that by placing a duty of three-fourths of 1 cent per gallon on blackstrap molasses this House would strike down a great and practically new industry in this country.

I am satisfied the distinguished gentleman from Michigan does not agree with me on this proposition, because a few days ago when I called his attention to the fact that we imported about 170,000,000 gallons of blackstrap during the last calendar year, he remarked that "it was just that many gallons more than we should have imported." In this, just as he is about all imports, he has seemingly one idea, and that is to build up a tariff wall so high that it will shut out all importation of goods to American markets. With all due deference to him I know he is wrong in his views as to the duty on blackstrap molasses.

Like the distinguished floor leader [Mr. MONDELL] the gentleman believes that this tariff bill "will have more general and united support and commendation both in the Congress and in the country than any tariff bill since the Civil War." The gentleman is indeed an optimist and this sanguine prophecy makes him one of the Pollyanna type. In so far as the House is concerned, with your large Republican majority, this bill unquestionably will pass, but it may be well for Congressmen to wait until they hear from their constituents before they take on the optimism of the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

I think there is already a little cloud on the horizon, not very large, it is true, but one that you Republicans might well watch. I predict that this cloud will grow to such proportions all over the country when the provisions of this bill are generally known—and especially when your American valuation provision is understood—that many, if not most, of the provisions of this bill will never meet the approval of the American

people, nor will they be written into the law of the land. There is already a protest of the feed men and western and southern cattle growers against this proposed tariff on blackstrap molasses, which is so extensively used in the preparation of feed for cattle. This excessively high rate of three-fourths of 1 cent per gallon means a duty of nearly 100 per cent and makes it practically impossible for sweet feed manufacturers to operate. It may be well before vaunting the popularity of this bill to see what other jokers it contains besides blackstrap molasses.

I repeat that I am glad the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has changed his mind and decided that this paragraph will be amended before the Democrats come into power, and again I would remind him that the Democrats will come into power at the next election if the House passes much legislation like this tariff bill.

Gentlemen of the committee, blackstrap molasses should be on the free list. The amendment offered by Mr. FORDNEY, which he says he offers "with great regret," proposes to reduce the rate prescribed by the bill of 1 cent per gallon to three-fourths of 1 cent per gallon. I have offered a substitute, which would make the rate thirty-eight one-hundredths of 1 cent per gallon. This is the rate fixed by your party in the emergency tariff bill. I suggested this rate of thirty-eight one-hundredths of 1 cent per gallon with the hope that it would meet with your approval and be a sort of compromise rate between those of us who believe that blackstrap should be on the free list and those of the Republican Party who believe that it should bear a duty of 1 cent per gallon, or even three-fourths of 1 cent per gallon. The lower we can fix the rate the better it will be for the country, in my judgment, and I would welcome an amendment to my substitute fixing a lower rate.

It is only in recent years that we have developed the manufacture of mixed sweet feeds, and to-day there is invested all over this Nation more than \$200,000,000 in this business. Blackstrap molasses is a very low grade, in fact, the lowest grade of molasses produced. Until recent years it was simply waste. The sugar it contains makes it valuable as a fattening feed for animals. I am informed that it will fatten a cow in about 90 days, using 40 per cent molasses rations. It decreases the expense of producing meat; it increases the production of milk; it adds to the alfalfa industry and makes valuable use of the by-products from human-food factories, like flour mills, oatmeal plants, corn-products factories, meat-packing houses, which by-products are now bought in carload lots and shipped to the various feed manufacturing plants.

Most of the blackstrap molasses is imported from Cuba, Hawaii, and Porto Rico, and some from the United Kingdom. Our domestic supply can not meet the demand. I understand that for the last few years only about 8 per cent of the amount needed has been produced in the United States, and it is estimated that we can not produce more than 13 per cent of the amount needed in the sweet-feed manufacturing business. I might also add that this blackstrap molasses is used with calcium arsenate to poison the boll weevil, cotton's greatest enemy, and grasshoppers in Western and Northern States. In addition to this, it is also used in the manufacture of alcohol prepared in the production of smokeless powder.

Mr. ROSENBLUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. ROSENBLUM. Is it not a fact that the greatest quantity of blackstrap is used for making industrial alcohol?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Oh, no. I will say to the gentleman that in times of war great quantities were used for that purpose, but in peace times practically 90 per cent of it is used for direct feeding of dairy cattle and farm animals of all kinds. Only about 60 per cent was used during the war for the manufacture of alcohol.

It costs about 2 cents a gallon in Cuba, about 1½ cents per gallon is charged for transportation from plantation to the Cuban port, 1½ cents per gallon for ocean freight to New Orleans or Mobile, and about thirty-eight one-hundredths of 1 cent duty under the emergency tariff, making a total of 5½ cents per gallon landed at Mobile or New Orleans. To this the importer must add something for the expense of equipping storage tanks, brokerage, and so forth. So you will see the American producer already has ample protection and more than is needed. If you put an additional burden on this business, gentlemen, you are going to destroy it. I appreciate the position of the gentleman from Louisiana on this proposition, yet you know it is not right for this Congress to destroy one industry of the country for the benefit of another. The people of Louisiana can not produce enough blackstrap to supply even a small percentage of the demand for it in this country. This duty you are proposing can not help their business.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Certainly; I am glad to yield to my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Is it not also a fact that an additional demand for this product is caused by the fact that the residue from distilled grain is no longer available and blackstrap is necessary to take its place?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes. I thank the gentleman for his valuable suggestion. It is a fact that in this day and time even the refuse or residue from distilled grain is not available. On Tuesday, in response to a question I asked the chairman of the committee, he quoted figures at length, which I could not understand and which I can not now understand when I read his remarks in the Record. Mr. FORDNEY stated:

We put a duty of 1 cent a gallon on blackstrap. There are thousands of tons produced in the United States. The purchaser from abroad imports it for 3 cents a gallon. Including a duty of 1 cent a gallon, that would be 30 cents a pound. There are 12 pounds of blackstrap in a gallon. The producers of ground alfalfa and other cattle feed mix that with 4 cents worth of the feed and then it is sold at over \$28 a ton, and where they use 60 per cent of blackstrap they are making \$16.80 a ton on the blackstrap, and they are here asking that it be reduced so that their profits can be increased. I want it doubled up.

Surely the gentleman is incorrect in these figures. He doubtless intended to say 30 cents per 100 pounds. The cost at New Orleans and Mobile to-day f. o. b. is 3½ cents a gallon, or approximately \$6 a ton. The freight and war tax to Chicago added makes a ton of blackstrap cost about \$12.50. If 40 per cent of a ton of mixed feed is blackstrap, there is approximately \$5 worth of blackstrap in a ton.

The price of alfalfa, I understand, is about \$22 a ton laid down at Chicago. Sixty per cent of this would be about \$13 worth of alfalfa in a ton of feed. I understand it costs about \$6 to mix the feed. Adding together the \$5 for the molasses, \$6 for mixing, \$13 for alfalfa, we have a ton of mixed feed at a cost of approximately \$24 on the Chicago market. Of course, it varies at different interior points. The Bureau of Markets informs me that it is selling to-day around \$28 per ton. You will see, gentlemen, that the gentleman from Michigan was wrong in his calculations. I have tried to get from the Department of Commerce, the Tariff Commission, and the Bureau of Markets such information as I could, and the figures I have just quoted are based on information I secured from the Bureau of Markets. I do not claim that they are absolutely correct, but approximately so. The former duty under the Underwood law, which was 15 per cent ad valorem, brought more than a half million dollars revenue into the Treasury. As a revenue measure I think it is amply high, and my substitute will unquestionably add to the revenue, if it is revenue you desire. I beg you, gentlemen, not to restrict the importation of this material, which is the very life of the sweet-feed manufacturing business. We want cheap feed, and can not have it if you further restrict importation of blackstrap.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the duty proposed in the bill, or by the amendment offered by a member of the committee, will add 1 acre of sugar-cane production in the United States, Hawaii, or Porto Rico. Blackstrap molasses in the main comes as a refuse from Cuba. It is a cattle food. I have heard so many Members of the House here interested in the production of cattle urge that we do something for the production of cattle. What is this proposition? To add to the cost. For what? It will not protect anybody; it will not add to the industry of the production of blackstrap molasses. What is the sense when we are trying to find other ways of encouraging cattle production to add to the expense of feeding cattle? [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for the amendment of Mr. McDUFFIE: Strike out the increase of thirty-eight one-hundredths and insert in lieu thereof twenty-five one-hundredths.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered carries the rate that was carried in the Underwood bill. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE] carries the rate which is carried in the emergency tariff bill. The committee has reported a provision fixing the rate at 1 cent a gallon on all molasses testing not above 48 per cent of total sugars, and with the further provision that two hundred and seventy-five one-thousandths of a cent be added for each per cent over 48, and now offers an amendment reducing the rate from 1 cent per gallon to three-fourths of a cent per gallon. Eighty to 90 per cent of blackstrap molasses is used in this country for direct feeding to



stock and the preparation of sweet feed balanced rations for animals. There is a small amount, as the gentleman from Alabama said, used with calcium arsenate for poisoning the boll weevil and grasshoppers in the West and Northwest. There are now over \$200,000,000 invested in feed-manufacturing plants in nearly every State in this Union. These mills were built because blackstrap molasses was available at a cheap price in practically unlimited quantities in all sugar-producing countries. I submit to you that if you propose to provide protection for industries in this bill then these mills costing over \$200,000,000 are as much and more entitled to protection than are the producers of blackstrap molasses in this country, who produce only 5.3 of the entire amount used in this country. If you place a tariff of three-fourths of a cent on every gallon of molasses testing not over 48 per cent of total sugars, and two hundred and seventy-five one-thousandths of a cent additional for each per cent over 48, you are going to greatly cripple these manufacturing plants, if not run the risk of destroying them and the mixed-feed business in this country. Personally, I would like to see blackstrap molasses imported into this country free in order that these manufacturing plants may thrive and that mixed feeds may be furnished cheaper to the farmers and stock raisers. Its great value has come to be recognized, for it will fatten a steer in 60 or 90 days when with other feeds it would take six months or more to do so. But I realize the impossibility of putting blackstrap on the free list and I have therefore offered an amendment which will restore the Underwood tariff rate, which was practically one-fourth of 1 cent per gallon, and under which this business was built up to its present proportions.

If you do not adopt my amendment, then you are adding to the cost of the farmer and of the stock raiser for the mixed feed that he feeds to his mules, to his horses, to his cattle, his hogs, and his sheep.

Something was said by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] the other day with reference to the profit derived by these mixed-feed manufacturers. I deny that they are getting any very great profit.

These sweet mixed feeds are prepared by mixing alfalfa meal with blackstrap molasses, which is the final by-product of the juice from sugar cane, in the ratio of perhaps 60 to 40, or perhaps a less ratio. Mr. Charles D. Jones, a prominent manufacturer of Nashville, writes me that alfalfa meal is laid down in Nashville from Colorado for \$28.50 per ton. Eighteen dollars of this amount represents the freight rate and the balance the cost of the alfalfa and its grinding and sacking. Blackstrap molasses is now selling for 3½ cents per gallon f. o. b. New Orleans, or \$12.16 per ton in Chicago. I am told by the Department of Commerce that mixed feeds sell on the market for about \$30 per ton. Thus you will see that, when the cost of the ingredients is taken into consideration, with the cost of labor and its manufacture, with reasonable return on investment, the gentleman from Michigan is entirely mistaken in his claim of great profit to the manufacturer. If you levy the tariff tax proposed in the committee amendment, then you will increase the cost of production over and beyond the cost of whole-grain feeds and thus entirely destroy this business which is so important to the farmer in the feeding of dairy cattle and other stock and the quick fattening of his cattle and hogs for the market.

As a matter of fact, if you want to raise revenue, then you ought to adopt the amendment which I have offered, which fixes the rate carried in the Underwood law, under which nearly \$500,000 was paid into the Treasury last year. There will be little revenue under the tariff proposed by the committee, for there will be little if any imports. The business will not stand it. We imported from Cuba last year 179,000,000 gallons of blackstrap molasses, as compared with only 10,000,000 gallons made in this country, in the whole United States. Why should we impose a tax upon all the manufacturers of mixed feeds and all the stock feeders of this country for the sole benefit and profit of this comparatively small production? It costs 1½ cents per gallon to transport the Cuban molasses from the place where it is made to the Cuban port. Then it costs a cent and a half to transport it across the Gulf to New Orleans, which with the emergency tariff of thirty-eight one-hundredths of a cent makes a total cost of 3.38 cents per gallon to get the blackstrap molasses from Cuba to New Orleans without taking into consideration its cost at the Cuban mills.

To my mind, if these few producers who produced only 5.3 per cent of the amount used last year are entitled to any protection whatsoever, which I deny, then certainly a protection of 3.38 cents a gallon upon molasses is sufficient without raising the tariff rate. Why, it brings only 3½ cents per gallon f. o. b. at New Orleans now, and you propose by raising the tariff

rate to afford these producers a protection exceeding in amount what it can now be bought for in New Orleans, including the present tariff rate. I repeat, if you put this tariff on blackstrap molasses as proposed by the committee you are going to injure and possibly destroy the mixed-feed business in this country to the very great detriment of the stock feeders, both large and small. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, the demand for this reduction in the duty on blackstrap molasses does not come from the consumer. It comes from two sources. It comes, first, from the man who imports blackstrap from Cuba—this is as black as your hat—and then bleaches it and places it on the market and sells it to the consumer of this country as Louisiana molasses or some other high-grade molasses. It comes in the next place from the mixed-feed man, who knows that this small amount of duty can not be passed on by him to the consumer, but who wishes to swell his profits. Just let me give you some figures as to what it cost the mixed-feed man to mix blackstrap molasses with his feed.

The average amount of blackstrap used in a ton of feed is 20 per cent, or 400 pounds to a ton. A gallon of blackstrap weighs 12 pounds, so that in 400 pounds there are 33⅓ gallons of molasses. A duty of 1 cent would therefore add 33⅓ cents to a ton of feed, and the duty of three-fourths of 1 cent, as proposed by Mr. FORDNEY in his amendment, would add 25 cents to a ton of feed, but let it be remembered that at this time there is a duty of 24 per cent ad valorem on blackstrap, and, placing the value of blackstrap at 3 cents a gallon, which is about its normal value, this would be equivalent to a specific duty of 0.72 cent a gallon.

On 400 pounds, or 33⅓ gallons of molasses, this would amount to 24 cents, or 9½ cents more per ton of feed, with a duty of 1 cent per gallon, and 1 cent more per ton with a duty of three-fourths of a cent per gallon, as proposed by Mr. FORDNEY. In other words, it would cost the feed mixer 1 cent more per ton of feed.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is it a fact that a majority of blackstrap molasses goes into this feed, or does a large majority of it go into the making of alcohol?

Mr. MARTIN. The proportion is 60 per cent for alcohol and 40 per cent for food.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Are not the gentleman's statements based on experience during the war? I submit that in time of peace 90 per cent goes into food.

Mr. MARTIN. They are the latest statistics.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then they are war statistics.

Mr. MARTIN. The war has been over for three years. Let us take the Payne rate, which carried a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem, and under that the additional cost on a ton of feed containing 400 pounds of blackstrap, over the rate carried in this bill, would be 13½ cents, and on a duty of three-quarters of a cent a gallon it would add 5 cents to the cost of a ton of feed.

These are absolutely accurate figures, and they can not be denied. Let us now take the Underwood rate of 15 per cent ad valorem, and we find that the difference would be 18½ cents on a ton of feed over the rate of 1 cent carried in the bill and 10 cents a ton on a rate of three-fourths of a cent just offered by Mr. FORDNEY.

Does anyone mean to tell me that the mixed-feed producers are going to add that to the cost price of the feed, or are they going to put that in their pocket as profit?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Is it not a fact that the development of this feed industry is the sole cause of your blackstrap molasses having any market value at all?

Mr. MARTIN. No.

Mr. KINCHELOE. They used to throw it out on the ground.

Mr. MARTIN. No. Before the war we used to get 6 and 7 cents a gallon for it, and now we can get no more than 3 or 4 cents, and this price does not pay to market it. The average wholesale price for feed in this country is \$28 per ton for mixed feed. In a ton of feed containing 20 per cent of blackstrap there are 400 pounds of blackstrap for which the mixer paid 3 cents per gallon f. o. b. New Orleans. As 1 gallon of blackstrap weighs 12 pounds, there is contained in a ton of feed 33⅓ gallons of blackstrap for which the mixer paid 3 cents a gallon, or a total to him of \$1 for what he put into the mixed feed.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I can not yield now. For the 400 pounds of blackstrap contained in 1 ton of mixed feed the mixer receives

at the rate of \$28 per ton, or 13.8 cents per pound, or a total of \$5.60 for the amount of blackstrap contained in a ton of feed, which makes him a profit of \$4.60 which he makes on the blackstrap alone.

Of course, your freight must be deducted. But they tell us that they put more than 400 pounds of blackstrap in a ton of feed. Then the more blackstrap they put in the more profit they make. I will show you why. Now, let us take feed containing 60 per cent of blackstrap. In 1 ton of mixed feed containing 60 per cent of blackstrap and selling for \$28 per ton there would be 1,200 pounds of blackstrap, equivalent to 100 gallons. This at 3 cents per gallon equals \$3, the cost of the blackstrap to the feed mixer. The 1,200 pounds of blackstrap contained in a ton of feed which was sold by the mixer at \$28 returns him \$16.80, or a profit of \$13.80 per ton.

The mixer of feeds who uses blackstrap has no cost to add for further preparation of the blackstrap, as it needs no grinding, but is incorporated into the other ingredients of the feed without further preparation. The only cost beyond the initial price of 3 cents per gallon is the freight on the blackstrap to his plant.

In Louisiana alone we make some 16,000,000 gallons of blackstrap, and unless we can market it for a price about 5 or 6 cents a gallon it does not pay us to pack and market it.

We certainly can not compete with Cuba when it is now being delivered f. o. b. New Orleans at 3½ cents per gallon.

The schedule submitted by the Ways and Means Committee is a just and scientific schedule. Under both the Underwood and Payne-Aldrich bills molasses under 40° carried an ad valorem duty, while molasses from 40° to 56° carried a specific duty, and above 56° still another specific duty. The result of this was that the Government was defrauded out of much revenue, because by adding a little water to high-grade molasses it was made to test under 40°, and was therefore admitted under the low ad valorem duty. The schedule in this bill will collect the duty on the total sugar contents. It starts at 48°, which will take in all molasses known as blackstrap, and for every degree above 48° it adds 0.275 of a cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in five minutes, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING] to have two minutes and I to have three minutes of that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the provisions of paragraph 503, which places a duty as follows:

PAR. 503. Molasses and sirups testing not above 48 per cent total sugars, 1 cent per gallon; testing above 48 per cent total sugars, 0.275 of 1 cent additional for each per cent of total sugars and fractions of a cent in proportion.

Blackstrap molasses is covered by this paragraph. This molasses is the uncrystallizable residue or final by-product from the juice of sugar cane, and the total sugars run from 45 to 62 per cent, and therefore if this bill passes as it now is you have an additional duty of 0.275 of 1 cent for each per cent over and above 48 per cent. I have a number of these factories in my district, one organized in my home city, which I am taking as an illustration, where men have put—and they are ordinary business men—\$100,000 into one of these concerns for the purpose of making sweet cattle feed. Here is what they say:

GALESBURG, ILL., July 12, 1921.

Hon. E. J. KING, M. C.,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I herewith confirm my wire to you of yesterday regarding the tariff on blackstrap molasses.

It will really be a calamity to we feed dealers if they make the tariff based on sugar content, as we will have to have a chemist at every mill to know what we are getting and this will be a big expense. If this molasses, which has had all possible sugar extracted from it that can be obtained, still averages 52 per cent sugar; if they run it on a 48 basis, as the original tariff, it will make a tariff of over 2 cents per gallon on a 52 per cent sugar content.

Thanking you for your kind consideration to this matter as suggested in our wire, which, we assure you, will be greatly appreciated, we remain,

Yours, truly,

GALESBURG MOLASSES FEED CO.,  
By B. L. CHRISTY, Secretary.

I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] will be adopted, and save these enterprises from ruin.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, there was produced in the United States last year 100,200 tons of blackstrap. There was imported a total of 74,000 tons, 60 per cent of which, the gentleman from Louisiana states, was used in the manufacture of alcohol and 40 per cent in the manufacture

of feed. Now, this cattle feed which has been talked about was incidental, as shown by this gentleman. The Federal Trade Commission handed me figures day before yesterday showing that out of every gallon of blackstrap imported at the present price of 3 cents per gallon there is a profit to the manufacturer of cattle feed of 12.8 cents per gallon. Feed is selling at \$28 per ton, which yields a profit, as before stated, of 12.8 cents on an investment of 4 or 5 cents. This should satisfy the greed of any profiteer. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee proceeded to divide.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, to save time, let us concede the motion is carried, because we have several very important amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee to the substitute is agreed to, and the question recurs on the substitute as amended.

The question was taken, and the substitute as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment as amended by the substitute.

The question was taken, and the amendment as amended by the substitute was agreed to.

Mr. FORDNEY. I have an amendment at the desk which I desire to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FORDNEY makes a unanimous-consent request that the Clerk be authorized to number correctly the paragraphs of the bill and the references to the paragraphs and to make such typographical corrections as may be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request for unanimous consent? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 145, line 14, strike out "or" where it occurs in the line and insert in lieu thereof the word "of."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. YOUNG: Page 212, line 10, after the comma following the word "institution," insert "including stained or painted window glass or stained or painted glass windows imported by houses of worship."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, this is substantially the same as the Underwood provision, which put these articles on the free list.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. YOUNG: Page 188, line 14, after the word "ash," strike out the semicolon and the balance of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof a period.

Mr. WALSH. What paragraph is this? What is the language that goes out of the bill?

Mr. YOUNG. The paragraph is 1527. It strikes out the words, "bones, burned or calcined, not ground and not otherwise manufactured."

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield? As I understood yesterday the committee struck out two words in this paragraph, and now the committee determines to strike all of them out. Is that the purpose?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Acting piecemeal.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BUTLER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 6611) to establish in the Treasury Department a veterans' bureau and to improve the facilities and service of such bureau and further to amend and modify the war risk insurance act, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives on the amendments.



of the Senate and had appointed Mr. SMOOT, Mr. CALDER, and Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### THE TARIFF.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] may address the House for seven minutes.

Mr. FREAR. Reserving the right to object, may I ask what the subject is?

Mr. LONGWORTH. In reference to what we will vote about to-day on the preferential amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. FREAR. I object.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to submit a parliamentary inquiry. Has the reading of the bill been concluded?

Mr. FORDNEY. The bill has been read, brother.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has the reading for amendment been concluded?

Mr. FORDNEY. You might read it in the nine minutes, but I hardly think so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to find out the parliamentary status before I give consent to the gentleman to address the House. Is it the purpose of the gentleman to have any further provisions of the bill read?

Mr. FORDNEY. The regular order would be to read the bill now, but I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object, to ascertain whether or not the gentleman is going to discuss any of the propositions?

Mr. FORDNEY. Nothing particular, brother.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is recognized. [Loud applause on the Republican side, the Members rising.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish personally to thank every Member, both on the Democratic and Republican side of the House, for the earnestness with which they have taken part on the floor of the House in the passage of this bill. The committee worked industriously for many weeks, beginning with the 6th day of January, and on every day, Sundays excepted—although I can not say that much for myself, because on many Sundays I have worked industriously on this bill to obtain information that might aid the committee in the preparation of a bill that in our judgment will assist in bringing prosperity to American capital and American labor. [Applause on the Republican side.] Each and every man, permit me to say, although we have had some rather heated discussions here, presented his views as he thought best, and without prejudice, and if, in our discussions, I have used a harsh expression, it was only because of my eagerness in the heat of debate. And I wish each and every man to forgive me for any harsh language I may have used in refuting some observation that may have been presented here.

I have nothing but the best of good will for every Member within the sound of my voice or beyond the sound of my voice. I have worked sincerely and industriously, and we now present here and in a few minutes the House will vote upon an important bill, containing 345 pages of most interesting matter to not only the people of the United States but of all the world.

There came to us from Canada, from Newfoundland, and from New Zealand and Australia gentlemen representing those Governments, who asked us to give preferential rates to certain imports from their own Provinces or countries. That would be impossible in tariff legislation, for under treaties with other Governments we are obligated to grant no country in the world a trade advantage over other nations except by commercial trade treaties. In this bill we have incorporated provisions, three in number, giving the President three options with which he may deal with other nations to secure favorable treatment of American commerce. One permits the reduction of duties in this bill to an extent of not to exceed 20 per cent below the rates herein provided. The other provision gives the President the right to make commercial trade treaties with foreign countries, subject to the approval of Congress. I believe that no tariff bill ever presented to this Congress has carried proposals inviting friendly trade negotiations that were more equitable and just than the trading provisions in this bill placed in the hands of the President of the United States.

Other countries of the world to-day are engaged, and they have been for many months, in making commercial trade treaties to secure trade advantages. Canada, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Australia, and other countries now can come, when this bill becomes a law, and find our President ready and willing to negotiate with them and enter into agreements and treaties that in his judgment may be beneficial to the people who elected him to office. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Gentlemen, I believe we have a bill here that will restore prosperity to our people.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman explained but two of the provisions. Will he state the third?

Mr. FORDNEY. I did, I believe, state the third. One gives the President the right to reduce duties not to exceed 20 per cent; the second gives him the right to negotiate to secure suspension of discriminating duties; and the third gives him the right to make a trade agreement, subject to the approval of the Congress of the United States. That is the substance of the three.

Now, gentlemen, with the best of good feeling and with thanks to every Member present, I ask for a vote on the separate amendments provided for in the rule. [Applause on the Republican side, the Members rising.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, if it is not yet 3 o'clock, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one more minute.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAR. 2. Acetaldehyde, aldol or acetalal, aldehyde ammonia, butyraldehyde, crotonaldehyde, paracetaldehyde, ethylene chlorohydrin, ethylene dichloride, ethylene glycol, ethylene oxide, glycol monoacetate, propylene chlorohydrin, propylene dichloride, and propylene glycol, 6 cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I rise to ask unanimous consent that the former order of the House may be set aside and that the Clerk may continue to read the bill until it is completed under the five-minute rule. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. I thought the gentleman was anxious to pass the bill.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that that is not in order. I thought that some Members of the House knew it, at least the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not proper for the committee to change a rule made by the House. It is now 3 o'clock post meridian.

Under the rule the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union will now rise. The bill H. R. 7456, "A bill to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage industries of the United States, and for other purposes," which has been considered by the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, will be reported back to the House with sundry amendments that have been agreed to and with certain amendments specified in the rule that have been disagreed to for further consideration in the House under the rule. [Applause.]

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7456, "A bill to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage industries of the United States, and for other purposes," and that the bill was reported back to the House with sundry amendments that had been agreed to and with a certain amendment specified in the rule that had been disagreed to, for further consideration in the House under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reports that that committee has had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7456) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage industries of the United States, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report it back to the House with sundry amendments that have been agreed to and with a certain amendment specified in the rule that had been disagreed to, for further consideration in the House under the rule. The previous question is already ordered on the bill and amendments, and, following precedent, the vote will be taken on the special paragraphs in the order in which they appear in the bill. First, is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to paragraph 27, relating to dyestuffs?

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on paragraph 27, relating to dyestuffs. The first proposition in the resolution is on hides.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin demands a separate vote on paragraph 27, relating to dyestuffs. In the consideration of the Payne-Aldrich bill the amendments were taken up in the order in which they appeared in the bill, and the Chair will follow that precedent. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FREAR: I move to amend by striking out all of paragraph 27 of the bill, including subdivisions (a) to (s), inclusive, and more particularly described as beginning at paragraph 27 (a), line 22, page 12, and striking out all thereafter down to and including all of line 19, page 22, of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the amendment will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 209, nays 193, answered "present" 2, not voting 26, as follows:

## YEAS—209.

Almon	Doughton	Knight	Robison
Anderson	Dowell	Kopp	Rose
Andrews	Drane	Kraus	Rosenbloom
Ansorge	Drewry	Kunz	Rossdale
Anthony	Driver	Lampert	Rouse
Arentz	Elliott	Lanham	Ryan
Aswell	Evans	Lankford	Sabath
Bankhead	Fairfield	Larsen, Ga.	Sanders, Tex.
Barbour	Fields	Lawrence	Sandlin
Barkley	Fish	Lea, Calif.	Scott, Tenn.
Beck	Fisher	Lee, Ga.	Sears
Bell	Fitzgerald	Linthicum	Shreve
Benham	Flood	Little	Sinclair
Black	Foster	Logan	Sinnot
Blakeney	Frear	London	Sisson
Bland, Va.	Fuller	Lowrey	Smithwick
Blanton	Fulmer	Lyon	Speaks
Boies	Gahn	McClintic	Sproul
Bowling	Garner	McCormick	Stafford
Box	Garrett, Tenn.	McDuffie	Stegall
Brand	Garrett, Tex.	McKenzie	Stedman
Briggs	Gensman	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Stevenson
Brinson	Gerner	McSwain	Stoll
Brown, Tenn.	Gilbert	Mansfield	Strong, Kans.
Browne, Wis.	Goldsborough	Michaelson	Strong, Pa.
Buchanan	Gorman	Montague	Summers, Wash.
Bulwinkle	Griffin	Moore, Ohio	Summers, Tex.
Burdick	Hammer	Moore, Va.	Swank
Burke	Hardy, Tex.	Morgan	Sweet
Burroughs	Harrison	Nelson, A. P.	Tague
Burtess	Haugen	Nelson, J. M.	Ten Eyck
Byrnes, S. C.	Hayden	Nolan	Thomas
Byrns, Tenn.	Herrick	Norton	Tillman
Cable	Hickey	O'Brien	Tyson
Cantrill	Hoch	O'Connor	Underhill
Carew	Huddleston	Ogden	Vinson
Carter	Hukriede	Oldfield	Voigt
Chandler, N. Y.	Hull	Oliver	Ward, N. C.
Clague	Humphreys	Overstreet	Wason
Cockran	Jacoway	Padgett	Weaver
Collier	James, Va.	Park, Ga.	White, Kans.
Collins	Jeffers, Ala.	Parks, Ark.	White, Me.
Connally, Tex.	Johnson, Ky.	Parrish	Williamson
Connell	Johnson, Miss.	Pou	Wilson
Connolly, Pa.	Jones, Tex.	Quin	Wingo
Cooper, Wis.	Kennedy	Raker	Wise
Coughlin	Kincheloe	Ramseyer	Woodruff
Cramton	Kindred	Rankin	Woods, Va.
Crisp	King	Rayburn	Wright
Davis, Minn.	Kinkaid	Reavis	Young
Davis, Tenn.	Klecza	Ricketts	
Deal	Kline, N. Y.	Roach	
Dominick	Kline, Pa.		

## NAYS—193.

Ackerman	Clouse	Fenn	Himes
Appleby	Codd	Fess	Hogan
Atkeson	Cole	Focht	Houghton
Bacharach	Colton	Fordney	Husted
Beedy	Cooper, Ohio	Free	Hutchinson
Begg	Copley	Freeman	Ireland
Bird	Crowther	French	James, Mich.
Bixler	Curry	Frothingham	Jeffers, Nebr.
Bland, Ind.	Dale	Glyn	Johnson, Wash.
Bond	Dallinger	Gould	Kahn
Bowers	Darrow	Goodykoontz	Kearns
Brennan	Dempsey	Graham, Ill.	Kelley, Mich.
Britten	Denison	Graham, Pa.	Kelly, Pa.
Brooks, Ill.	Dickinson	Green, Iowa	Kendall
Brooks, Pa.	Dunbar	Greene, Mass.	Ketcham
Burtou	Dunn	Greene, Vt.	Kless
Butler	Dupré	Griest	Kirkpatrick
Campbell, Kans.	Dyer	Hadley	Kissel
Cannon	Echols	Hardy, Colo.	Knutson
Chalmers	Edmonds	Hawley	Kreider
Chindblom	Ellis	Hays	Larson, Minn.
Christopherson	Elston	Hersey	Layton
Clarke, N. Y.	Faust	Hill	Lazaro
Classon	Favrot		

Leatherwood	Moore, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.	Timberlake
Lee, N. Y.	Moore, Ind.	Reed, W. Va.	Tincher
Lehlbach	Morin	Rhodes	Tinkham
Lineberger	Mott	Riddick	Towner
Longworth	Mudd	Rodenberg	Treadway
Luce	Murphy	Rogers	Vare
Luhning	Newton, Minn.	Sanders, Ind.	Vestal
McArthur	Newton, Mo.	Sanders, N. Y.	Volk
McFadden	Olpp	Scott, Mich.	Volstead
McLaughlin, Mich.	Osborne	Shaw	Walsh
McLaughlin, Pa.	Paige	Shelton	Walters
McPherson	Parker, N. J.	Siegel	Ward, N. Y.
MacGregor	Parker, N. Y.	Slomp	Watson
Madden	Patterson, Mo.	Smith, Idaho	Webster
Magge	Patterson, N. J.	Smith, Mich.	Wheeler
Mann	Perkins	Snell	Williams
Mapes	Perlman	Snyder	Winslow
Martin	Peters	Steenerson	Wood, Ind.
Merritt	Petersen	Stephens	Woodyard
Michener	Porter	Swing	Wurzbach
Miller	Pringey	Taylor, N. J.	Wyant
Mills	Purnell	Taylor, Tenn.	Yates
Millsbaugh	Radcliffe	Temple	
Mondell	Ransley	Thompson	
Montoya	Reber	Tilson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Chandler, Okla. Fairchild

NOT VOTING—26.

Campbell, Pa.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rainey, Ill.	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Fla.	Keller	Riordan	Taylor, Colo.
Cullen	Kitchin	Robertson	Upshaw
Gallivan	Langley	Rucker	Vaile
Hawes	Maloney	Schall	Zihlman
Hicks	Mead	Stiness	
Hudspeth	Rainey, Ala.	Sullivan	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. FAIRCHILD (for) with Mr. HICKS (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. MALONEY with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. STINESS with Mr. HUDSPETH.

Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma with Mr. RAINEY of Alabama.

Mr. KELLER with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.

Mr. ZIHLMAN with Mr. GALLIVAN.

Mr. SCHALL with Mr. UPSHAW.

Miss ROBERTSON with Mr. HAWES.

Mr. VAILE with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I find that I am paired with my colleague from New York, Mr. HICKS. Therefore I wish to withdraw my vote and to answer "present."

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. UPSHAW. I think not. I think I came in just afterwards.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not come within the rule.

Mr. UPSHAW. I would have voted "yea" if I had been here.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The announcement of the vote was received with applause.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on paragraph 89, the oil paragraph?

Mr. BLANTON. I demand a separate vote on it, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: Page 35, strike out lines 9 and 10, and on page 200, line 10, after the word "petroleum" insert the words "crude, fuel or."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on that oil amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. As many as favor ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Twenty-one Members, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Does anyone demand a separate vote on paragraph 207, asphalt? [After a pause.] No demand is made.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, what becomes of the amendment?

The SPEAKER. It stands as it was left by the committee. The Chair thinks if no one demands a separate vote, it will be voted upon with the other amendments en gross.

Mr. MANN. There is no authority for that in the rule. The en gross vote applies only to committee amendments. I have no objection.



Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, the vote was so overwhelmingly against the duty on asphalt that I think it would be a waste of time to ask for the yeas and nays on that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he should put the question to a vote.

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on paragraph 1557, cotton?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the amendment proposing a duty on long-staple cotton?

Mr. TREADWAY. That is the Bowers amendment. It was inserted at the beginning of the cotton schedule.

The SPEAKER. It was offered to paragraph 1557. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOWERS: Page 192, paragraph 1557, line 15, after the comma insert the words "not specially provided for"; and on page 113, between lines 9 and 10, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Cotton, having a staple of 1½ inches or more in length, 15 per cent ad valorem."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FORDNEY. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 198, nays 217, not voting 15, as follows:

## YEAS—198.

Ackerman	Ellis	Kraus	Rhodes
Anderson	Elston	Langley	Riddick
Andrews	Fairchild	Lankford	Roach
Ansorge	Fairfield	Larsen, Ga.	Robertson
Anthony	Faust	Larson, Minn.	Robison
Appleby	Favrot	Lawrence	Rodenberg
Arentz	Focht	Layton	Rose
Aswell	Fordney	Lazaro	Ryan
Atkeson	Frear	Lea, Calif.	Sanders, Ind.
Barbour	Free	Leatherwood	Sandlin
Beedy	Fuller	Lee, Ga.	Scott, Tenn.
Begg	Funk	Lineberger	Shaw
Benham	Garner	Little	Shelton
Bird	Gensman	Lubring	Shreve
Blakeney	Gerner	McKenzie	Sinclair
Bland, Ind.	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sinnot
Blanton	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Smith, Idaho
Bowers	Graham, Pa.	McPherson	Smith, Mich.
Brooks, Ill.	Hadley	Magee	Smithwick
Brown, Tenn.	Haugen	Martin	Steenerson
Buchanan	Hawley	Michener	Strong, Kans.
Burtess	Hayden	Miller	Strong, Pa.
Butler	Hays	Millsbaugh	Sweet
Campbell, Kans.	Herrick	Mondell	Swing
Chalmers	Hersey	Montoya	Taylor, Tenn.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hickey	Moore, Ill.	Thompson
Chandler, Okla.	Hill	Morgan	Timberlake
Christopherson	Hoch	Mudd	Tincher
Clarke, N. Y.	Hogan	Nelson, A. P.	Towner
Classon	Hukriede	Newton, Mo.	Vare
Clouse	Hull	Nolan	Vestal
Codd	Humphreys	Ogden	Walters
Cole	Ireland	Osborne	Watson
Colton	James, Mich.	Overstreet	Webster
Connell	Jeffers, Nebr.	Park, Ga.	Wheeler
Connolly, Pa.	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. J.	White, Kans.
Cooper, Ohio	Jones, Pa.	Parrish	Williams
Coughlin	Kahn	Patterson, Mo.	Williamson
Cramton	Kelley, Mich.	Petersen	Wilson
Crowther	Kelly, Pa.	Porter	Wood, Ind.
Curry	Kendall	Pringley	Woodruff
Denison	Ketcham	Purnell	Woodyard
Dickinson	Kless	Radcliffe	Wurzbach
Dowell	King	Raker	Wyant
Dunbar	Kinkaid	Ransley	Yates
Dupré	Kissel	Reavis	Young
Dyer	Kline, N. Y.	Reece	Zihlman
Echols	Kline, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.	
Edmonds	Knutson	Reed, W. Va.	
Elliott			

## NAYS—217.

Almon	Browne, Wis.	Cooper, Wis.	Fields
Bacharach	Bulwinkle	Copley	Fish
Bankhead	Burdick	Crisp	Fisher
Barkley	Burke	Cullen	Fitzgerald
Beck	Burroughs	Dale	Flood
Bell	Burton	Dallinger	Foster
Bixler	Byrnes, S. C.	Darrow	Freeman
Black	Byrnes, Tenn.	Davis, Minn.	French
Blanch, Va.	Cable	Davis, Tenn.	Frothingham
Boies	Cannon	Deal	Fulmer
Bond	Cantrill	Dempsey	Gahn
Bowling	Carew	Dominick	Gallivan
Box	Carter	Doughton	Garrett, Tenn.
Brand	Chindblom	Drane	Garrett, Tex.
Brennan	Clague	Drewry	Gibbert
Briggs	Cockran	Driver	Glynn
Brinson	Collier	Dunn	Goldsborough
Britten	Collins	Fenn	Gorman
Brooks, Pa.	Connally, Tex.	Fess	Gould

Green, Iowa  
Greene, Mass.  
Greene, Vt.  
Griest  
Griffin  
Hammer  
Hardy, Colo.  
Hardy, Tex.  
Harrison  
Himes  
Houghton  
Huddleston  
Husted  
Hutchinson  
Jacoway  
James, Va.  
Jeffers, Ala.  
Johnson, Ky.  
Johnson, Miss.  
Kearns  
Kennedy  
Kincheloe  
Kindred  
Kirkpatrick  
Klecza  
Knight  
Kopp  
Kreider  
Kunz  
Lampert  
Lanham  
Lee, N. Y.  
Lehlbach  
Linthicum  
Logan

London  
Longworth  
Lowrey  
Luce  
Lyon  
McArthur  
McClintic  
McCormick  
McDuffie  
McFadden  
McSwain  
MacGregor  
Madden  
Mann  
Mansfield  
Mapes  
Mead  
Merritt  
Michaelson  
Mills  
Montague  
Moore, Ohio  
Moore, Va.  
Moore, Ind.  
Morin  
Mott  
Murphy  
Nelson, J. M.  
Newton, Minn.  
Norton  
O'Brien  
O'Connor  
Oldfield  
Oliver  
Olpp  
Padgett

Paige  
Parker, N. Y.  
Parks, Ark.  
Patterson, N. J.  
Perkins  
Perlman  
Peters  
Pou  
Quin  
Rainey, Ala.  
Rainey, Ill.  
Ramseyer  
Rankin  
Rayburn  
Reber  
Ricketts  
Riordan  
Rogers  
Rosenbloom  
Rossdale  
Rouse  
Sabath  
Sanders, N. Y.  
Sanders, Tex.  
Scott, Mich.  
Sears  
Siegel  
Sisson  
Snell  
Snyder  
Speaks  
Sproul  
Stafford  
Stegall  
Stedman  
Stephens

Steverson  
Stoll  
Sullivan  
Summers, Wash.  
Summers, Tex.  
Swank  
Tague  
Taylor, N. J.  
Temple  
Ten Eyck  
Thomas  
Tillman  
Tilson  
Tinkham  
Treadway  
Tyson  
Underhill  
Upshaw  
Vinson  
Voigt  
Volk  
Volstead  
Walsh  
Ward, N. Y.  
Ward, N. C.  
Ward  
Weaver  
White, Me.  
Wingo  
Winslow  
Wise  
Woods, Va.  
Wright

## NOT VOTING—15.

Campbell, Pa.  
Clark, Fla.  
Hicks  
Hudspeth

Johnson, S. Dak.  
Jones, Tex.  
Keller  
Kitchen

Maloney  
Rucker  
Schall  
Stiness

Taylor, Ark.  
Taylor, Colo.  
Vaile

So the amendment was rejected.

The following additional pairs were announced:

General pairs:

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. MALONEY with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. STINESS with Mr. HUDSPETH.

Mr. KELLER with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.

Mr. VAILE with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.

Mr. HICKS with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCHALL with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to paragraph 1582, with reference to hides?

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will first report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma: Page 195, lines 12 and 13, strike out paragraph 1582 and insert, on page 109, between lines 17 and 18, the following: "Par. 782. Hides and skins of all kinds, raw, green, dried, pickled, and prepared or preserved in any manner, 15 per cent ad valorem."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon demands the yeas and nays.

The question was taken, and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 173, nays 241, not voting 16, as follows:

## YEAS—173.

Anderson	Clouse	Griest	Leatherwood
Andrews	Cole	Hadley	Lee, Ga.
Anthony	Colton	Hardy, Colo.	Lineberger
Arentz	Cooper, Ohio	Haugen	Little
Aswell	Cooper, Wis.	Hayden	Lubring
Atkeson	Cramton	Hays	McCormick
Barbour	Curry	Herrick	McKenzie
Beck	Davis, Minn.	Hickey	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Begg	Deal	Hoch	McPherson
Bell	Denison	Hukriede	Magee
Benham	Dickinson	Hull	Mansfield
Bird	Dowell	Humphreys	Martin
Blakeney	Dupré	Husted	Michener
Bland, Ind.	Echols	James, Mich.	Miller
Blanton	Elliott	Jeffers, Nebr.	Millsbaugh
Boies	Ellis	Johnson, Wash.	Mondell
Bowers	Evans	Jones, Tex.	Montoya
Brooks, Ill.	Fairfield	Kelley, Mich.	Moore, Ill.
Brooks, Pa.	Faust	Kelly, Pa.	Moore, Ohio
Brown, Tenn.	Favrot	Kendall	Moore, Va.
Browne, Wis.	Fordney	Ketcham	Morgan
Buchanan	Foster	King	Murphy
Burtess	Frear	Kinkaid	Nelson, A. P.
Cable	French	Knutson	Nelson, J. M.
Campbell, Kans.	Fuller	Kopp	Newton, Mo.
Chandler, Okla.	Funk	Lampert	Nolan
Christopherson	Garner	Lankford	Ogden
Clague	Gensman	Lawrence	Osborne
Classon	Goodykoontz	Lazaro	Padgett
	Graham, Ill.	Lea, Calif.	Park, Ga.

Parrish	Robison	Strong, Kans.	Wheeler
Patterson, Mo.	Rodenberg	Summers, Wash.	White, Kans.
Pringle	Sanders, Ind.	Sweet	Williams
Purnell	Sandlin	Swing	Williamson
Raker	Scott, Tenn.	Taylor, Tenn.	Wilson
Ramseyer	Shaw	Ten Eyck	Wood, Ind.
Reavis	Shelton	Thompson	Woodruff
Reece	Sinclair	Timberlake	Woodyard
Reed, N. Y.	Sinnott	Tincher	Wurzbach
Reed, W. Va.	Slomp	Towner	Wyant
Rhodes	Smith, Idaho	Vestal	Young
Ricketts	Smith, Mich.	Voigt	
Riddick	Smithwick	Volstead	
Roach	Steenerson	Webster	

## NAYS—241.

Ackerman	Fairchild	Lanham	Robertson
Almon	Fenn	Larsen, Ga.	Rogers
Ansorge	Fess	Larson, Minn.	Rose
Appleby	Fields	Layton	Rosenbloom
Bacharach	Fish	Lee, N. Y.	Rossdale
Bankhead	Fisher	Lehibach	Rouse
Barkley	Fitzgerald	Linthicum	Ryan
Beedy	Flood	Logan	Sabath
Bixler	Focht	London	Sanders, N. Y.
Black	Free	Longworth	Sanders, Tex.
Bland, Va.	Freeman	Lowrey	Scott, Mich.
Bond	Frothingham	Luce	Sears
Bowling	Fulmer	Lyon	Shreve
Box	Gahn	McArthur	Slagle
Brand	Gallivan	McClintic	Sisson
Brennan	Garrett, Tenn.	McDuffie	Snell
Briggs	Garrett, Tex.	McFadden	Snyder
Brinson	Gerner	McLaughlin, Mich.	Speaks
Britten	Gilbert	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sproul
Bulwinkle	Glynn	McSwain	Stafford
Burdick	Goldsborough	MacGregor	Stegall
Burke	Gorman	Madden	Stedman
Burroughs	Gould	Mann	Stephens
Burton	Graham, Pa.	Mapes	Stevenson
Butler	Green, Iowa	Mead	Stoll
Byrnes, S. C.	Greene, Mass.	Merritt	Strong, Pa.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Greene, Vt.	Michaelson	Sullivan
Cantrill	Griffin	Mills	Summers, Tex.
Carew	Hammer	Montague	Swank
Carter	Hardy, Tex.	Moore, Ind.	Tague
Chalmers	Harrison	Morin	Taylor, N. J.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hawes	Mott	Temple
Chindblom	Hawley	Mudd	Thomas
Clarke, N. Y.	Hersey	Newton, Minn.	Tillman
Cockran	Hill	Norton	Tilson
Codd	Himes	O'Brien	Tinkham
Collier	Hogan	O'Connor	Treadway
Collins	Houghton	Oldfield	Tyson
Connally, Tex.	Huddleston	Oliver	Underhill
Connell	Hutchinson	Olpp	Upshaw
Connolly, Pa.	Ireland	Overstreet	Vare
Copley	Jacoway	Paige	Vinson
Coughlin	James, Va.	Parker, N. J.	Volz
Crisp	Jeffers, Ala.	Parker, N. Y.	Walsh
Crowther	Johnson, Ky.	Parks, Ark.	Walters
Cullen	Johnson, Miss.	Patterson, N. J.	Ward, N. Y.
Dale	Jones, Pa.	Perkins	Ward, N. C.
Dallinger	Kearns	Perlman	Watson
Darrow	Kennedy	Peters	Watson
Davis, Tenn.	Kless	Petersen	Weaver
Dempsey	Kincheloe	Porter	White, Me.
Dominick	Kindred	Pou	Wingo
Doughton	Kirkpatrick	Quin	Winslow
Drane	Kissel	Radcliffe	Wise
Drewry	Klecza	Rainey, Ala.	Woods, Va.
Driver	Kline, N. Y.	Rainey, Ill.	Wright
Dunbar	Kline, Pa.	Rankin	Yates
Dunn	Knight	Ransley	Zihlman
Dyer	Kraus	Rayburn	
Edmonds	Kreider	Reber	
Elston	Kunz	Riordan	

## NOT VOTING—16.

Campbell, Pa.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Langley	Stiness
Clark, Fla.	Kahn	Maloney	Taylor, Ark.
Hicks	Keller	Rucker	Taylor, Colo.
Hudspeth	Kitchin	Schall	Vaile

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:  
Until further notice:

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. MALONEY with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. STINESS with Mr. HUDSPETH.

Mr. KELLER with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.

Mr. VAILE with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.

Mr. HICKS with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the other amendments en grosse.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. On the theory that hides were to be on the dutiable list, a compensatory duty was given the various articles of manufactured leather, as I understand it. What I want to know is, can the House now rescind its action in giving compensatory duties to various articles of manufactured leather?

Mr. SNEEL. There were none.

Mr. STAFFORD. None was carried.

Mr. LONDON. How about cotton?

Mr. STAFFORD. There was only one, a duty of 3 per cent on laces.

Mr. MCARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the other amendments en grosse.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, let us have the yeas and nays on that.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 239, nays 126, not voting 15, as follows:

## YEAS—239.

Ackerman	Fairfield	Larson, Minn.	Reed, W. Va.
Anderson	Faust	Lawrence	Rhodes
Ansorge	Favrot	Layton	Ricketts
Anthony	Fenn	Lazaro	Riddick
Appleby	Fess	Lea, Calif.	Roach
Arentz	Fish	Leatherwood	Robertson
Atkeson	Fitzgerald	Lee, N. Y.	Robison
Bacharach	Focht	Lehibach	Rodenberg
Barbour	Fordney	Lineberger	Rogers
Beedy	Foster	Little	Rose
Begg	Frear	Longworth	Rosenbloom
Benham	Free	Luce	Rossdale
Bird	Freeman	Luhling	Ryan
Bixler	French	McArthur	Sanders, Ind.
Blakeney	Frothingham	McCormick	Sanders, N. Y.
Bland, Ind.	Fuller	McFadden	Schall
Boles	Funk	McKenzie	Scott, Mich.
Bond	Gahn	McLaughlin, Mich.	Scott, Tenn.
Bowers	Gensman	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Shaw
Brennan	Gerner	McLaughlin, Pa.	Shelton
Britten	Glynn	McPherson	Shreve
Brooks, Ill.	Goodykoontz	MacGregor	Siegel
Brooks, Pa.	Gorman	Madden	Sinnott
Browne, Wis.	Gould	Magee	Slomp
Burdick	Graham, Ill.	Mann	Smith, Idaho
Burke	Graham, Pa.	Mapes	Smith, Mich.
Burroughs	Green, Iowa	Martin	Snell
Burtess	Greene, Mass.	Merritt	Snyder
Burton	Greene, Vt.	Michaelson	Speaks
Butler	Griest	Michener	Sproul
Tague	Hadley	Miller	Stafford
Campbell, Kans.	Hardy, Colo.	Mills	Steenerson
Cannon	Haugen	Millsbaugh	Stephens
Chalmers	Hawley	Mondell	Strong, Kans.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hays	Montoya	Strong, Pa.
Chandler, Okla.	Herriek	Moore, Ill.	Summers, Wash.
Chindblom	Hersey	Moore, Ohio	Sweet
Christopherson	Hickey	Moore, Ind.	Swing
Clague	Hill	Morgan	Taylor, N. J.
Clarke, N. Y.	Himes	Morin	Taylor, Tenn.
Classon	Hoch	Mott	Temple
Clouse	Hogan	Mudd	Thompson
Codd	Houghton	Murphy	Tilson
Cole	Hukriede	Nelson, A. P.	Timberlake
Colton	Hull	Nelson, J. M.	Tincher
Connell	Husted	Newton, Minn.	Tinkham
Connolly, Pa.	Hutchinson	Newton, Mo.	Towner
Cooper, Ohio	Ireland	Nolan	Treadway
Cooper, Wis.	Jeffers, Nebr.	Norton	Underhill
Copley	Johnson, Wash.	Ogden	Vare
Coughlin	Jones, Pa.	Olpp	Vestal
Cramton	Kahn	Osborne	Volstead
Crowther	Kearns	Paige	Walsh
Curry	Keiley, Mich.	Parker, N. J.	Walters
Dale	Kelly, Pa.	Parker, N. Y.	Ward, N. Y.
Dallinger	Kendall	Patterson, Mo.	Watson
Darrow	Kennedy	Patterson, N. J.	Webster
Davis, Minn.	Ketcham	Perlman	Wheeler
Dempsey	Kless	Peters	White, Kans.
Denison	King	Petersen	White, Me.
Dickinson	Kinkaid	Porter	Williams
Dowell	Kirkpatrick	Pringle	Williamson
Dunbar	Kissel	Purnell	Winslow
Dunn	Klecza	Radcliffe	Wood, Ind.
Dyer	Kline, N. Y.	Raker	Woodruff
Echols	Kline, Pa.	Ramseyer	Wurzbach
Edmonds	Knight	Ransley	Wyant
Elliott	Knutson	Reavis	Yates
Ellis	Kopp	Reber	Young
Elston	Kraus	Reece	Zihlman
Evans	Kreider	Reed, N. Y.	
Fairchild	Lampert		

## NAYS—126.

Almon	Connally, Tex.	Hayden
Andrews	Crisp	Huddleston
Aswell	Cullen	Humphreys
Bankhead	Davis, Tenn.	Jacoway
Barkley	Deal	James, Mich.
Beck	Dominick	James, Va.
Bell	Doughton	Jeffers, Ala.
Black	Drane	Johnson, Ky.
Bland, Va.	Drewry	Johnson, Miss.
Blanton	Driver	Jones, Tex.
Bowling	Dupré	Kincheloe
Box	Fields	Kindred
Brand	Fisher	Kunz
Briggs	Flood	Lanham
Brinson	Fulmer	Lankford
Brown, Tenn.	Gallivan	Larsen, Ga.
Buchanan	Garner	Lee, Ga.
Bulwinkle	Garrett, Tenn.	Linthicum
Byrnes, S. C.	Garrett, Tex.	Logan
Byrnes, Tenn.	Gilbert	London
Cantrill	Goldsborough	Lowrey
Carew	Griffin	Lyon
Carter	Hammer	McClintic
Cockran	Hardy, Tex.	McDuffie
Collier	Harrison	McSwain
Collins	Hawes	Mansfield





Hill	Luce	Patterson, N. J.	Speaks
Himes	Luhning	Perkins	Sprout
Hoch	McArthur	Perlman	Stafford
Hogan	McCormick	Peters	Steenerson
Houghton	McFadden	Petersen	Stephens
Hukriede	McKenzie	Porter	Strong, Kans.
Hull	McLaughlin, Mich.	Pringle	Strong, Pa.
Husted	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Purnell	Summers, Wash.
Hutchinson	McLaughlin, Pa.	Radcliffe	Sweet
Ireland	McPherson	Raker	Swing
James, Mich.	MacGregor	Ramsayer	Taylor, N. J.
Jeffers, Nebr.	Madden	Ransley	Taylor, Tenn.
Johnson, Wash.	Magge	Reavis	Temple
Jones, Pa.	Mann	Reber	Thompson
Kahn	Mapes	Reece	Tilson
Kearns	Martin	Reed, N. Y.	Timberlake
Kelley, Mich.	Merritt	Reed, W. Va.	Tincher
Kelly, Pa.	Michaelson	Rhodes	Tinkham
Kendall	Michener	Ricketts	Towner
Kennedy	Miller	Riddick	Treadway
Ketcham	Mills	Roach	Underhill
Kless	Millsbaugh	Robertson	Vare
King	Mondell	Robison	Vestal
Kinkaid	Montoya	Rodenberg	Volk
Kirkpatrick	Moore, Ill.	Rose	Volstead
Kissel	Moore, Ohio	Rosenbloom	Walters
Klecza	Moore, Ind.	Rossdale	Ward, N. Y.
Kline, N. Y.	Morgan	Ryan	Watson
Kline, Pa.	Morin	Sanders, Ind.	Watson
Knutson	Mott	Sanders, N. Y.	Webster
Kopp	Mudd	Schall	Wheeler
Kraus	Murphy	Scott, Mich.	White, Kans.
Kreider	Nelson, A. P.	Scott, Tenn.	White, Me.
Larson, Minn.	Newton, Minn.	Shaw	Williams
Lawrence	Newton, Mo.	Shelton	Williamson
Layton	Nolan	Shreve	Winslow
Lazaro	Norton	Siegel	Wood, Ind.
Lea, Calif.	Ogden	Sinnott	Woodruff
Leatherwood	Olpp	Slemp	Woodward
Lee, N. Y.	Osborne	Smith, Idaho	Wurzbach
Leibach	Palge	Smith, Mich.	Wyant
Lineberger	Parker, N. J.	Snell	Yates
Little	Parker, N. Y.	Snyder	Young
Longworth	Patterson, Mo.		Zihlman

## NAYS—127.

Almon	Drewry	Lanham	Riordan
Aswell	Driver	Lankford	Rouse
Bankhead	Fields	Larsen, Ga.	Sabath
Barkley	Fisher	Lee, Ga.	Sanders, Tex.
Beck	Flood	Lanthicum	Sandlin
Bell	Fulmer	Logan	Sears
Black	Gahn	London	Sinclair
Bland, Va.	Gallivan	Lowrey	Sisson
Blanton	Garner	Lyon	Smithwick
Bowling	Garrett, Tenn.	McClintic	Steagall
Box	Garrett, Tex.	McDuffie	Stedman
Brand	Gilbert	McSwain	Stevenson
Briggs	Goldsborough	Mansfield	Stoll
Brinson	Griffin	Mead	Sullivan
Buchanan	Hammer	Montague	Summers, Tex.
Bulwinkle	Hardy, Tex.	Moore, Va.	Swank
Byrnes, S. C.	Harrison	Nelson, J. M.	Tague
Byrnes, Tenn.	Hawes	O'Brien	Ten Eyck
Cantrill	Hayden	O'Connor	Thomas
Carew	Huddleston	Oldfield	Tillman
Carter	Humphreys	Oliver	Tyson
Cockran	Jacoway	Overstreet	Upshaw
Collier	James, Va.	Padgett	Vinson
Collins	Jeffers, Ala.	Park, Ga.	Volgt
Connally, Tex.	Johnson, Ky.	Parks, Ark.	Ward, N. C.
Crisp	Johnson, Miss.	Parrish	Weaver
Cullen	Jones, Tex.	Pou	Wilson
Davis, Tenn.	Kincheloe	Quin	Wingo
Deal	Kindred	Rainey, Ala.	Wise
Dominick	Knight	Rainey, Ill.	Woods, Va.
Doughton	Kunz	Rankin	Wright
Drane	Lampert	Rayburn	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Walsh

## NOT VOTING—14.

Clark, Fla.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Maloney	Taylor, Colo.
Gould	Keller	Rucker	Valle
Hicks	Kitchin	Stiness	
Hudspeth	Langley	Taylor, Ark.	

So the bill was passed.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I came in just a little while ago. They were calling my name when I was just entering the door there.

The SPEAKER. The theory is that the gentleman's name was not called at all. That is the theory. Therefore if the gentleman will say that he was present and listening when his name was called, he can vote; otherwise the Chair could not recognize him to vote.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I was here the first time.

The SPEAKER. It is up to the gentleman to state where he was.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Well, I was in the room; I was here. I was here when my name was first called.

The SPEAKER. How does the gentleman vote?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I desire to vote "yea."

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. WALSH (for) with Mr. KITCHIN (against).

Mr. GOULD (for) with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas (against).  
 Mr. HICKS (for) with Mr. KELLER (against).  
 Mr. MALONEY (for) with Mr. RUCKER (against).  
 Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for) with Mr. LEE of Georgia (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. VAILE with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.

Mr. STINESS with Mr. HUDSPETH.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. I desire to withdraw my vote of "yea" and be recorded as "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. WALSH, and he answered "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. FORDNEY, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MALONEY] is sick at the hospital and was therefore unable to be present to vote on the tariff bill. He regrets this very much and wished me to state on the floor that if present he would vote in favor of free hides, free oil, and free asphalt; for a duty on dyes, and in opposition to an embargo on dyes, and would be opposed to recommitting the bill, and would vote in favor of the bill as amended for final passage.

## VETERANS' BUREAU.

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6611, which was passed by the Senate yesterday, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6611, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate on the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6611) to establish in the Treasury Department a veterans' bureau, and to improve the facilities and service of such bureau, and further to amend and modify the war risk insurance act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. WINSLOW, Mr. PARKER of New York, Mr. SWEET, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. RAYBURN.

## CONTESTED ELECTION CASE OF BOGY V. HAWES.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Elections No. 1, to submit a privileged report in the contested election case of Bernard P. Bogy v. Harry B. Hawes, from the eleventh congressional district of the State of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DALLINGER, from the Committee on Elections No. 1, submitted the following report on the contested election case of Bernard P. Bogy v. Harry B. Hawes, from the eleventh congressional district of the State of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the House Calendar.

## MINUTES OF A VOTE IN THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

Mr. CLOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution authorizing and directing the Clerk of the House and the clerk of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-sixth and Sixty-seventh Congresses of the United States to disclose by deposition certain minutes and proceedings of said committee, and the vote of former Congressman Cordell Hull, one of its members, on a certain bill referred to said committee.

Whereas a suit is now pending in the circuit court of Putnam County, Tenn., styled Cordell Hull v. Wynne F. Clouse et al., involving the question of the vote of former Congressman Cordell Hull upon a certain bill referred to the Ways and Means Committee: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the clerk of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-sixth and Sixty-seventh Congresses of the United States and the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to give their depositions in the above-styled cause, upon demand of either party thereto, and disclose the record vote of former Congressman Cordell Hull, as a member of said committee in committee during the Sixty-sixth Congress, on the bill H. R. 14089, being, "A bill to provide compensation for veterans of the World War, to provide revenue therefor, and for other purposes"; be it further

Resolved, That to this end said clerks, or either of them, upon demand, exhibit to their depositions certified copies of the minutes and proceedings of said committee, or such portions thereof as relate to said bill and disclose the vote of said ex-Congressman Cordell Hull, in committee, thereon.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. POUL. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BECK, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence, indefinitely, on account of important business.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to make an announcement. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. The members of the American Legion are invited to dine with the new national commander at 7.30 at the Raleigh Hotel to-night.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-night it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-night it adjourn to meet on Monday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bonus bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the bonus bill. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, July 25, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

196. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting request for appropriations for \$125,000,000 for the period of July 31 to December 31, 1921, for the United States Shipping Board (H. Doc. No. 103), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars herein named, as follows:

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 163) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the Eighty-eighth Division Association for their reunion at Des Moines, Iowa, tents, cots, mattresses, blankets, and galvanized-iron buckets, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 276), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 172) granting consent of Congress to an agreement or compact entered into between the State of New York and the State of New Jersey for the creation of the port of New York district and the establishment of the port of New York authority for the comprehensive development of the port of New York, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 279), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7864) providing for sundry matters affecting the Naval Establishment, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 280), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DALLINGER, from the Committee on Elections No. 1, submitted a report (No. 281) on the contested-election case of *Bogy v. Hawes*, which said report was referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. RANSLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4845) for the relief of J. W. La Bare, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 277), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3425) for the relief of Benjamin R. Buffington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 278), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLAGUE: A bill (H. R. 7878) to increase the cost of the public building at Fairmont, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 7879) to standardize paper for agricultural production, to establish discount markets for such paper, to create two necessary fiscal and financial agents for the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BECK: A bill (H. R. 7880) for the purchase of ground and the erection of a Federal building at Viroqua, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 7881) to authorize the governor of the Territory of Hawaii to ratify the agreements of certain persons made with the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii and to issue land patents to those eligible under the terms of said agreements; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 7882) for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress amongst the several States under the Fourteenth Census; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 7883) to provide for the examination of persons brought before the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 7884) authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer to the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., all right and title now vested in the United States to the Pittsburgh storage and supply depot; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. APPLEBY: A bill (H. R. 7885) to simplify the revenue act of 1918, to repeal the war-profits and excess-profits tax and certain other taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 7886) for the better protection of the lives, limbs, and property of persons from the violence of mobs, and to reimburse the injured, their heirs, and the United States under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7887) to amend section 11 of chapter 517 of the act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, and to extend and enlarge the time for taking appeals and suing out writs of error in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINDRED: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 178), authorizing the Secretary of War to cancel the contract for the removal of Coenties Reef, in the East River, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BUTLER: Resolution (H. Res. 159) for the immediate consideration of House bills 7864, 7848, 7102, and 7103; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIRD: A bill (H. R. 7888) granting a pension to Elvira F. Jarrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7889) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Jane Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7890) granting a pension to Serena C. McKinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 7891) granting a pension to Catherine Bolger Krause; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 7892) to provide for a survey of Sarasota Bay, Fla., with a view to securing increased depth and width in the channel from the Gulf of Mexico to the city of Sarasota, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ECHOLS: A bill (H. R. 7893) for the relief of Capt. George G. Seibels, Supply Corps, United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 7894) for the relief of Michael H. Lorden; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 7895) granting a pension to Maggie A. Farrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 7896) granting an increase of pension to Nancy L. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGAN: A bill (H. R. 7897) granting a pension to Daniel Crowley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS: A bill (H. R. 7898) authorizing the President to appoint Joseph Byron White a captain in the Quartermaster Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUSTED: A bill (H. R. 7899) for the relief of the dependent parents of Fred Ward; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 7900) granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LUHRING: A bill (H. R. 7901) granting a pension to Luttitia Stillwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7902) granting a pension to Martha J. Dukate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7903) to extend the benefits of the employers' liability act of September 7, 1916, to Richard B. Davis, a former employee in the Rural Mail Service at Marietta, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 7904) granting a pension to Jesse C. Cawood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 7905) for the relief of John Dilks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 7906) granting a pension to Effie Fatheree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YATES: A bill (H. R. 7907) granting a pension to Kate B. Shatzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2095. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Clyde E. Filkins and 15 others, of the young men's class of the Memorial Church, Springfield, Mass., urging relief for the Armenians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2096. Also (by request): Petition of A. G. Shoup, secretary of the Ketchikan Commercial Club, of Ketchikan, Alaska, transmitting a copy of resolutions adopted by said club, together with data supporting the same, petitioning for a duty on all halibut or salmon, or the products thereof, arriving at an American port from or through any foreign country, which have been packed or prepared for shipment in other than American territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2097. Also (by request): Petition of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, indorsing the American Legion's plan of adjusted compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2098. Also (by request): Petition of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, urging the passage of House bill 4391, declaring The Star-Spangled Banner as the national anthem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2099. Also (by request): Petition of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, urging an appropriation to defray the expenses of having abstracts bearing upon the personal history and war services of each Revolutionary pensioner compiled, arranged, and printed by the Government in a form convenient for ready reference; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2100. Also (by request), resolution adopted by the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, urging the passage of House bill 140, for the purpose of erecting on the battle field of Monmouth a suitable memorial to perpetuate the heroism of Capt. Mollie Pitcher; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2101. Also (by request), petition of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, favoring the establishment by Congress, by right of eminent domain or otherwise, of a small national park, of a size to effectually safeguard the Old North Church, Salem Street, Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2102. By Mr. APPLEBY: Resolutions adopted by the Board of Chosen Freeholders of Monmouth County, N. J., approving House bill 7369, entitled "A bill making illegal the pollution of the navigable waters of the United States by oil and other refuse matter, and providing a penalty therefor," and urging its speedy enactment by Congress; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2103. Also, resolution adopted by the Association of North Jersey Shore Municipalities, approving House bill 7369, entitled "A bill making illegal the pollution of the navigable waters of the United States by oil and other refuse matter, and providing a penalty therefor," and urging its speedy enactment by Congress; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2104. Also, resolution adopted by the Board of Chosen Freeholders of Middlesex County, N. J., urging the appropriation of a sum sufficient to carry out the improvements in Raritan Bay and Raritan River, N. J., recommended by the Corps of Engineers, War Department; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2105. By Mr. CLAGUE: Petition of the Ladies' Club, of Winnebago, Minn., urging relief for peoples of the Near East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2106. Also, petition of citizens of Fulda, Minn., favoring the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2107. By Mr. DYER: Petition of Charter Stove & Range Co., of St. Louis, Mo., urging reductions in appropriations and economy in expenditure as a relief from the burdensome and cumbrous taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2108. Also, resolution passed by the Missouri Grain Dealers' Association relative to giving grain, grain products, and hay freight rates first consideration in the inevitable revision of the transportation rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2109. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Dr. George Keenan, Jr., and 29 other doctors, relative to the recognition of republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2110. By Mr. KINDRED: Petition of H. A. Metz & Co. (Inc.), of 122 Hudson Street, New York City, protesting against the high tariff duty on coal-tar products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2111. Also, petition of John J. Van Kuyk, of Corona, Long Island, N. Y., urging relief for the Armenians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2112. By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: Resolution of the First Reformed Church of Bethlehem, Pa., favoring disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2113. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of L. Bernardaud & Co., of New York City, N. Y., opposing the tariff duty on china; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2114. By Mr. LAYTON: Petition of National Shoe Retailers' Association of the United States of America (Inc.), Philadelphia, Pa.; Delmarvia Leather Co., Standard Kid Manufacturing Co., Delaware Leather Co., J. Austin Ellison Martin Leather Co., and the Cox & Lloyd Leather Co., of Wilmington, Del., opposing the proposed duty of 15 per cent on raw goat-skins and kid skins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2115. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of W. C. Van Sant & Co., of Baltimore, Md., protesting against paragraph 1432 of tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2116. By Mr. LUHRING: Resolution of the Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, of Princeton, Ind., indorsing proposed constitutional amendment to prohibit sectarian appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2117. By Mr. MONDELL: Petition of the Wyoming State Council, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, of Casper, Wyo., asking recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2118. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of A. S. Dudley, of Sacramento, and Wylie M. Griffin, president California Associated Raisin Co., of San Francisco, Calif., urging a 3-cent per pound tariff on imported beans; also petition of C. Wilson McNeeley, chairman goat and cabrette leather division of the Tanners' Council, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the proposed duty of 15 per cent on raw goat and kid skins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2119. Also, petition of the Western Pacific Local, No. 743, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, of Sacramento, Calif., and Lodge No. 148, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers, of Vallejo, Calif., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 171; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2120. Also, petition of Berkeley Den, International Lions, of Berkeley, Calif., indorsing Senate bill 597, providing for the



establishment of foreign industrial zones; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2121. Also, petition of W. M. Marble, of San Francisco, Calif., indorsing Senate bill 1252 and House bill 7, known as the Towner-Sterling bill; to the Committee on Education.

2122. By Mr. REECE: Petition of G. T. Copenhagen, president of the Hamilton-Bacon-Hamilton Co. (Inc.), of Bristol, Va.-Tenn., opposing the proposed tariff duty on grass seed and clover as contained in the Fordney tariff bill (H. R. 7456); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2123. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of numerous citizens of Van Wert, Ohio, in favor of the Towner-Sterling bill; to the Committee on Education.

2124. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Black Silk Stove Polish Works, of Sterling, Ill., opposing a 10 per cent duty on graphite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2125. Also, petition of American Flyer Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, Ill., urging tariff on toys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2126. Also, petition of Mr. J. G. Everest, of Chicago, Ill., opposing any duty to be placed on lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2127. Also, petition of Millers' National Federation, of Chicago, Ill., favoring the admission of foreign wheat, duty free, to be ground in bond or under a liberal drawback arrangement, provided the entire identical product shall be exported; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2128. Also, petition of Mary E. Smith, of Evanston, Ill., protesting against the Fordney bill, increasing duties on imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2129. Also, petition of goat and cabrette leather division of the Tanners' Council, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against duty of 15 per cent on raw goat and kid skins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2130. Also, petition of the A. D. Jackson Saddlery Co., of Benton, Ill., urging tariff of 35 per cent on harness and saddlery goods brought into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2131. Also, petition of Mr. Charles W. La Porte, of Peoria, Ill., urging an increase in the force and salaries in the Patent Office; to the Committee on Patents.

2132. Also, petition of Central Commercial Co., of Chicago, Ill., urging passing of Harrison naval stores' bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2133. Also, petition of R. J. Ogle, salesman for Patton-Pitcairn division of Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., urging passage of House bill 5632, the bill supplemental to the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2134. Also, petition of the American Farm Bureau Federation, of Chicago, Ill., urging an increase of the loan limit of the Federal land banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, July 22, 1921.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we would again renew our confidence in Thee, believing Thou art true to Thy word and will ever remember the trustful soul. We humbly beseech of Thee this morning that along the line of duty we may recognize the hand that is guiding and fulfill Thy good pleasure. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

### NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary, George A. Sanderson, read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1921.

### TO THE SENATE:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CHARLES CURTIS, a Senator from the State of Kansas, to perform the duties of the Chair this legislative day.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,  
President Pro Tempore.

Mr. CURTIS thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Wednesday, July 20, 1921, when, on request of Mr. SMOOT and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

### CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harris	McCumber	Sheppard
Ball	Harrison	McKellar	Shortridge
Brandagee	Heflin	McLean	Simmons
Broussard	Hitchcock	McNary	Smoot
Bursum	Johnson	Moses	Spencer
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Sterling
Capper	Kellogg	New	Swanson
Caraway	Kendrick	Nicholson	Townsend
Culberson	Kenyon	Norbeck	Trammell
Curtis	Keyes	Norris	Underwood
Dial	King	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Ernst	Knox	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Ladd	Poindexter	Watson, Ga.
Fletcher	La Follette	Pomerene	Williams
Gerry	Lenroot	Reed	Willis
Glass	Lodge	Robinson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

### EXPORTATION OF FARM PRODUCTS.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska submits a request for unanimous consent, which will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] asks unanimous consent that at not later than 5 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Tuesday, July 26, 1921, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill (S. 1915) to provide for the purchase of farm products in the United States, to sell the same in foreign countries, and for other purposes, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition, and that after the hour of 12 o'clock noon on said calendar day no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than five minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than five minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not wish to have the morning hour or the day taken up in the discussion of a matter of this kind. If the Senator will present the request after the bill to be voted on to-day is disposed of, I shall be glad to give it consideration then. I do not want to discuss or settle this question when we have a bill of great importance to vote on at 4 o'clock. For those reasons I object.

Mr. NORRIS. In view of the statement of the Senator from Missouri, I give notice that when the voting is concluded on the special order of the day I shall resubmit the request.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6611) to establish in the Treasury Department a veterans' bureau and to improve the facilities and service of such bureau, and further to amend and modify the war risk insurance act; had agreed to the conference requested by the Senate; and that Mr. WINSLOW, Mr. PARKER of New Jersey, Mr. SWEET, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. RAYBURN were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7208. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Roanoke River in Halifax County, N. C.; and

H. R. 7456. An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

### PROPOSED TARIFF ON COTTON.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that immediately after the disposal of the maternity and infancy bill I shall submit some observations to the Senate respecting the cotton schedule of the tariff bill that has just come over from the House.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from a number of prominent officials and citizens of the State of Washington that Congress take immediate action to prevent the impending disaster in Armenia.